NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

10c

Royal Oak, Michigan | April 28, 1941 | Subscription: Three Dollars Per Year

ADMINISTRATION PUTS U. S. 'IN THE MIDDLE'

(See Page 3)

Msgr. Ryan Writes a Letter; Implies Fr. Coughlin Is 'Faker'

(See Page 5)

Monopoly Committee Hits Concentration of Wealth

(See Page 14)

We Stand Criticized for Our Stand on Ford Strike

COMMENT ON WORLD EVENTS ★ REP. DIES' LIST OF REDS IN C.I.O. ★ ENGLISH SCHOLAR PLEADS FOR JUSTICE

Dinner Chat

'What Good Came of It?'

ORDINARILY we try to avoid "war talk" in this chat with readers, but the world situation being what it is, we can't resist the temptation to reprint the famous poem, "After Blenheim," submitted by a SOCIAL JUSTICE fan in New Albany, Indiana.

Written by the English poet, Robert Southey (1774-1843), "After Blenheim" carries a message particularly appropriate in the present day, when Americans are being edged into a foreign war that well may spell disaster for the nation.

After Blenheim

It was a summer evening,
Old Kaspar's work was done,
And he before his cottage door
Was sitting in the sun;
And by him sported on the green
His little grandchild Wilhelmine.

She saw her brother Peterkin
Roll something large and round
Which he beside the rivulet
In playing there had found;
He came to ask what he had found
That was so large and smooth and round.

Old Kaspar took it from the boy
Who stood expectant by;
And then the old man shook his head
And with a natural sigh
'Tis some poor fellow's skull,' said he,
'Who fell in the great victory.

'I find them in the garden,
For there's many here about;
And often when I go to plough
The ploughshare turns them out.
For many thousand men,' said he,
'Were slain in that great victory.'

'Now tell us what 'twas all about,'
Young Peterkin he cries;
And little Welhelmine looks up
With wonder-waiting eyes;
'Now tell us all about the war,
And what they fought each other for.'

'It was the English,' Kaspar cried,
'Who put the French to rout;
But what they fought each other for
I could not well make out.
But everybody said,' quoth he,
'That 'twas a famous victory!

'My father lived at Blenheim then,
Yon little stream hard by;
They burnt his dwelling to the ground,
And he was forced to fly:
So with his wife and child he fled
Nor had he where to rest his head.

'With fire and sword the country 'round
Was wasted far and wide,
And many a childing mother then
And newborn baby died:
But things like that, you know, must be
At every famous victory.

'They say it was a shocking sight
After the field was won;
For many thousand bodies here
Lay rotting in the sun:
But things like that, you know, must be
After a famous victory.

'Great praise the Duke of Marlbro' won
And our good Prince Eugene';
'Why 'twas a very wicked thing!'
Said little Wilhelmine;
'Nay . . . nay . . . my little girl,' quoth he,
'It was a famous victory.

'And everybody praised the Duke
Who this great fight did win.'
'But what good came of it at last?'
Quoth little Peterkin:—
'Why that I cannot tell,' said he,
'But 'twas a famous victory.'

Fr. Coughlin's Friends Plan Jubilee Visits

STILL two months away, Father Coughlin's Silver Jubilee Celebration already promises to bring together at the Shrine of the Little Flower huge crowds of the Radio Priest's friends from New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Minnesota and other states.

Bryan B. O'Rourke of New York City, telling us of the tour he has arranged for the occasion, writes:

"If there ever was a time when there should be an earnest effort made to encourage and give consolation to the man who is fighting our battle, it is during this time when he needs the support of every lover of social justice, and I think there should be a supreme effort made to visit the Shrine during this Silver Jubilee Week, June 29 to July 5.

"With this in mind, I have contacted some of the great admirers of Father Coughlin in New York, Brooklyn and vicinity and they have suggested to me that I conduct a tour to the Shrine over the weekend of July 4th. I have consented to do so.

"We will leave New York on the night of July 3rd and will arrive in Buffalo on the morning of the 4th. We will leave Buffalo by boat that evening at 6 o'clock and arrive in Detroit at 8 o'clock Saturday morning. Leaving the Shrine Saturday night, we will arrive back in New York the following evening.

"This tour will be available to all followers of Father Coughlin from New Jersey, New York, and Massachusetts and will be conducted at the very low rate of about $23.

"I am looking forward with keen anticipation to having the largest group of Father Coughlin's friends to join me on this splendid trip for a splendid cause."

Although full details will appear in future issues of SOCIAL JUSTICE, all mail or phone inquiries will be received gladly by Mr. O'Rourke. **His address: 1817 Westchester Avenue, Bronx, New York. Phone: Westchester 7-1731 and Westchester 7-1371.**

* * *

FROM Minneapolis comes word that a Minnesota contingent is making plans for a Shrine visit on the following schedule:

Lv. Minneapolis, 8 a. m., June 28, Milwaukee Road; Ar. Chicago, 2:50 p. m.

Lv. Chicago, 4:15 p. m., Wabash R. R.; Ar. Detroit, 10 p. m.

No return schedule has been announced, since many persons will wish to remain in Detroit longer than others.

J. J. Burns of Minneapolis, in charge of the tour, reports that although the individual round trip coach fare from Minneapolis to Detroit is $25, a special rate of $20.80 will be available for persons traveling in parties of 15 or more. Persons leaving in such groups may return individually if they wish, within a ten day limit. This will permit a stop-over at Chicago for those who desire it.

For the information of readers in Minneapolis and vicinity J. J. Burns may be reached by telephone at **Regent 3081, Minneapolis.**

Misses Radio Discourses

A FLINT, Michigan, reader agrees heartily that the 25th anniversary of Father Coughlin's admittance to the priesthood should be marked by appropriate celebrations such as those mentioned above.

But, she inquires, "is anything being done to get Father Coughlin back on the air?

"I certainly hope there is," she continues, "for I sincerely believe that if the Reverend Father was on the radio at the time the Lease-Lend Bill was being debated it never would have been passed by Congress."

Subskripshuns Comin' In Real Good 'Cordin' to Pete

HELLO, FOLKS:

Seems like I wuz here t' see y' justa day 'r so ago, but I guess it wuz longer ago'n that, 'cause I got dragged inta th' offuce by th' nape uv th' neck 'n told t' get busy — 'n just when th' fellas from th' school 'round th' corner were goin' good at th' ol' game uv marbuls. Darn it all — I wuz jus' beginnin' t' get th' point when th' substitoot editer came out after me. I might uv put up a bit uv a fight if it'd been Perrin, but this other fella is a littul younger 'n c'n run a bit faster. Then, too, I reelize he's kinda upset these days on akkount uv havin' t' do extry work, 'n we all should be a littul more konsiderut, I know.

Not that I don't *like* t' visut with y', mind. But these days are so beyootiful that a persun jus' wants t' stay out all th' time.

* * *

Maybe it wuz th' nice, warm wether that made y' get out 'n get all th' new subskripshuns that th' mailman's been bringin' inta th' offuce these days. Thanks. We shure appreshiate them.

May Schulte ses t' thank y', too, f'r th' renooals. They've been comin' in encouragin' numbers. While we are always glad, y' know, t' make new frien's, there reely is a lot uv satisfakshun in knowin' that y'r old ones 're still with ya, even if it does meen a lotta sakrafice on their part, 'n we do reelize that right now, with all th' strikes 'n things, it's been mighty hard f'r y' t' send in th' subskripshun fee f'r SOCIAL JUSTICE.

Well, I guess I'll skip along now 'n see whut's whut at home. I've been away all day jus' romin' around enjoyin' myself. Mother Coughlin'll begin t' think she's minus one Great Dane if I don't show up soon. Mus'nt worry her too much 'r I'll get a good skoldin'.

See y' later, folks. S'long!

— Pete.

16 PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

Liberty of conscience and education.

Just living annual wage.

Nationalization of important public resources.

Private ownership of all other property.

Control of private property for public good.

Abolition of Federal Reserve Banking System and establishment of a Government-owned Central Bank.

Restoration to Congress of its sole right to coin and regulate the value of money.

Cost of living maintained on an even keel.

Cost of production plus a fair profit for the farmer.

Labor's right to organize.

Recall of non-productive bonds.

Abolition of tax-exempt bonds.

Broadened base of taxation on basis of ownership and capacity to pay.

Simplification of Government and lower taxes.

Conscription of wealth as well as men in event of war.

Sanctity of human rights preferred to sanctity of property with Government's chief concern for the poor.

SOCIAL JUSTICE National Weekly. Copyrighted 1941 by the Social Justice Publishing Company. publication and editorial office, Royal Oak, Michigan. Subscription price, United States and possessions, $3.00 per year. Unless otherwise directed, all subscriptions begin with the current issue. Three weeks are required to effect change of subscriber's address. Give both old and new addresses. Entered as second class matter, March 12, 1937, at the Post Office, Royal Oak, Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 1879. E. Perrin Schwartz, Editor; Cora Quinlan, Secretary-Treasurer.
SOCIAL JUSTICE is fully protected by copyright and nothing that appears in it may be reprinted either wholly or in part, without special permission. The use of articles or quotations from SOCIAL JUSTICE for digest, advertising, promotions and stock-selling schemes is never authorized.
Vol. 7 April 28, 1941 No. 17

SUBSCRIPTION COUPON

Date_____

Name _____

Address_____ City_____

State_____ Subscription rate $3 a year. Renewal ☐ New ☐

SOCIAL JUSTICE PUBLISHING CO., Royal Oak, Michigan

Comment

In the Middle

THE United States is definitely "in the middle" — thanks to the short-sighted, ruinous foreign policy practiced by the New Deal.

Across the Atlantic lies Europe dominated by Adolf Hitler; across the Pacific lies Asia soon to be dominated by Japan.

Years ago both in SOCIAL JUSTICE and on the air-waves, Father Coughlin indicated that the New Deal foreign policy would result in forcing a consolidation of Russian and German efforts.

And nine months ago, approximately, it was stated that, should actual fighting be engaged in by the United States, probably it would occur in the Orient.

At that time Russia appeared to be hostile to Japan.

At that time the New Deal was cocksure of its ability to hold Russia's friendship.

Today Russia and Japan have signed a non-aggression pact which consolidates Asia against us.

Truly, America is in the middle.

From the outset of World War No. 2 it was plain to honest observers that it was a contest in which anti-capitalism was arrayed against international capitalism; the "have-nots" against the "haves"; the non-gold nations against the gold-mongering nations.

Democracy or non-democracy played no important part in this contest except that the words offered a springboard for propaganda.

The existence of the Russian-Japanese pact was a foregone conclusion discerned by many observers outside the New Deal orbit.

Does this pact favor Russia and the ultimate victory of Marxism? Positively.

Does this pact favor Japan and her policy of Asiatic expansion? Positively.

Does this pact favor Adolf Hitler and his ultimate victory over the British? Positively.

Finally, does this pact render hors de combat the wild foreign policy espoused by Mr. Roosevelt and the international gold-mongers who surround him? Positively.

Previous to the Presidential elections last November, this weekly indicated that the worst error committed by Mr. Roosevelt during his terms of office was related to the sad foreign policy which his flatterers proclaimed would make him, eventually, the world's policeman and the world's savior.

As matters stand today, America is isolated.

As matters stand today, all our talk of "all aid for Britain" is nothing more than talk; for we will be busied, henceforth, devising all aid for United States against the time when we will become the objects of attack by the hordes of Asia and the armies of Europe.

The *Chicago Tribune* (April 15) said editorially:

"Mr. Roosevelt's foreign policy of making the United States a British dominion and his domestic policy of making this country a subsidiary of the Communist government hasn't worked. Russia persists in being Great Britain's enemy and Hitler's ally. While we endeavor to give all aid to Great Britain, the tolerated Russian Communist cells here control our merchant fleet and disrupt the output of munitions. The aid Mr. Roosevelt undertakes to give the British is impaired by the Russians, who themselves give aid to the three Axis powers now threatening the existence of the British Empire.

"The consequences of Mr. Roosevelt's policy are no stranger than the policy itself. Both can be described as incredible. They belong in Bedlam. It is the moral fashion in Washington and some other quarters to regard appeasement as a turpitude which pollutes the character. The people who use the word as if it were one by which a person can be thrown into the outer darkness have made some curious distinctions which common sense is unable to grasp.

"In the opinion of the *Tribune* there are three men in Europe whose character, doctrines, and acts classify them as villains. They are brutal, unscrupulous, faithless, and apparently remorseless. They are Adolf Hitler, Benito Mussolini, and Josef Stalin. The villainies of Stalin are not only of longer duration than the villainies of the other two, but they have had a cruelty and a callousness which even the others could not equal.

"Stalin has added an Asiatic refinement of torture to the Marxist indifference to human suffering. Since 1926 he has been the sole arbiter of Russian destiny and Ivan the Terrible appears as a kindly man by comparison. No Russian czar ever inflicted upon his own or other peoples so many unpardonable and unmentionable injuries as have been inflicted by this barbarian from Asiatic Transcaucasia.

"One of Mr. Roosevelt's first strokes of foreign policy was to give this Red tyrant the accolade of civilization's recognition and the warmth of sympathetic reception. Only once has Mr. Roosevelt faltered in his devotion to this friendship with the great tyranny in the world, and that period which seemed to be one of disapproval soon was seen to be merely one of a slight bending to the public opinion here outraged by the unprovoked attack upon Finland, Poland, and the Baltic countries. When the storm of disapproval was thought to have subsided Mr. Roosevelt returned to the program of appeasement and since has undertaken to support this particular tyranny while hurling his thunderbolts as well as the resources of the nation against the two other demons afflicting the world."

In these days of truth-hiding, no one logically can expect either Mr. Hull or Mr. Churchill to appraise at its value the Russian-Japanese pact. Both of them will minimize it.

Nevertheless, Britain, pilloried in Northern Africa and in Greece, soon will be prepared to give up the ghost in England itself.

And what of the British navy when that day arrives?

Will it seek shelter in the harbors of America?

That is a question which cannot be answered with a positive "yes" when one considers the feelings of the sailors who man the British navy. Their wives and children, so they will remember, will be held as hostages in England.

It is possible that the British navy will surrender, in part, to the victorious Nazis or be scuttled before the sailors will surrender their loved ones to the Mad Man of Europe, as they have been taught to regard Adolf Hitler.

Mr. Roosevelt's foreign policy is but another step towards national disaster.

It has placed the United States in the middle.

Index to Comment

In the Middle ..... Page 3

We Stand Criticized; Britain's Post-War Aims; Lehman Brothers ..... Page 4

Mgsr. Ryan Writes a Letter; Reds Flirt With Irish ..... Page 5

Editorials—Jews and Lent; Lend-Lease Stymied; A 'Must' for War ..... Page 6

Pay Envelopes and Taxes; Racism; A Sense of Humor Saves Harold Ickes Page 7

Horrendous Harold; Col. Knox Reforms; Purge Hangs Fire ..... Page 8

Scare of the Week — Hitler to Capture America via Texas; English Invasion of 1839 ..... Page 9

British Democracy as Seen in Newfoundland; Those Cagey People; Ireland Page 10

An English Scholar Pleads for Justice; Graft in Defense ..... Page 11

The C.I.O. and Reds; Canada's Prime Minister Speaks ..... Page 12

Phelps Bill Dead—Wire from Author; Hoover Mercy Plan ..... Page 13

Monopoly Committee Hits Money Powers ..... Page 14

Mexico Veers Toward New Deal Socialism; Pope Pius' Warning ..... Page 15

New York Times Called Paganistic; History Repeating Itself; Christians and War ..... Page 18

Most Rev. Gerald Shaughnessy; 'Hadar' Gives Sound Advice; Important Notice; Good Thinking ..... Page 19

Britain's Power Unused ..... Page 20

Comment

We Stand Criticized

FOR THE stand which SOCIAL JUSTICE took relative to the Ford strike, we were severely criticized by the rank and file members of labor unions and their friends.

These ladies and gentlemen have a right to their own opinion.

We have a right to ours.

In so far as the strikes impeded all aid for Britain — and we omit the words "short of war" — there may have been something good in the strikes.

In so far as the strikes manifested the long-suspected ability of the C.I.O. to overpower local agents of law; and, in so far as it is a stated fact that Communist activists were successful in herding 85,000 men to do their bidding, we are appalled.

Possibly, a strike was needed — the only weapon employable to bring about the recognition of unionism in the Ford industry.

And, probably, the strike was encouraged by the attitude of those henchmen of the Ford industry who were responsible for some of the grievances enunciated by the strike leaders.

Aside from all that, we stand by our assertion that the Ford strike is an indication of an eventual victory for Karl Marx in America.

In no wise are we defending the wrongs of industry nor challenging the rights of labor.

We are lamenting, however, the lack of American Christian leadership in the ranks of labor which, in many instances, is now dominated by Marxian Reds who are abetted in their program to establish a proletarian government by a group of nonmilitant Christians content to ride the pendulum as it swings leftward.

In days gone by, they should have been crusading vigorously against Red organizers, Red leaders, Red philosophy and Red objectives identified with the movement of C.I.O.-ism.

Truly, in days gone by there was an opportunity to establish a Christian American C.I.O.

We are pessimistic enough to incline towards the opinion that those days have gone by.

Today SOCIAL JUSTICE is proud of the stand which both its editors and Father Coughlin assumed in the embargo fight and in the neutrality fight.

Then it was said that these were steps which inevitably would lead to war.

Few idealists; few laborites; few friends of labor agreed with us when we proclaimed that "cash and carry" would evolve into "credit and carrion." We couldn't prove one contention in those days. We simply said: "Wait and see."

All that we can say at the present about the C.I.O. is — wait and see.

Wait and see, when strikes are called both in General Motors and afterwards in the Chrysler Corporation.

Wait and see, when the C.I.O. wins a victory of closed shopism.

Wait and see, when the C.I.O. wins a victory of check-offism.

Wait and see, when the C.I.O. emerges as the strongest, most powerful political force in this hemisphere — a political force dominated not by Christians but by Marxists; a political force imbued with ideals expounded not by bishops but by Bolsheviks.

As intimated elsewhere in these pages, there are some people who cannot see the Reds because they mingle too frequently with them. It is another case of not being able to see the forest for the trees.

Britain's Post-War Aims

THE United Press (April 3) prints the following London dispatch.

"Geoffrey Mander, Liberal, presented to Parliament today for discussion an eight-point statement of British war aims which he based on the New York speech of British Ambassador Viscount Halifax.

"Mander's resolution stated the points as follows:

"1. Co-operation between nations for mutual economic welfare and, if necessary, for mutual defense.

"2. Establishment of an international order recognizing a 'change in relations between states.'

"3. Willingness to join with any state which seeks world peace and prosperity by observing engagements and insuring individual liberty within its frontiers.

"4. Exploration of the utilization of the British Empire as a 'bridge to greater world unity.'

"5. Treatment of the world as a unitary whole in handling problems.

"6. Promotion of common interests by the greatest possible interchange of goods.

"7. Maintenance of sufficient post-war armed strength to insure the peace.

"8. Refusal to negotiate peace with Adolf Hitler, and a pledge against territorial claims."

It is evident from the eight proposals made by Mr. Mander that some parliamentarians in Great Britain will demand the retention of the *status quo* for British imperialism.

More than that, there is an inferred note of "union nowism" — political and economic — which, translated, means that the American way of life will be reduced to the British Empire's way of life — an empire which includes India where hundreds of millions of people live on less than ten cents a day.

In one sense, China is under the thumb of Great Britain. It is interesting to note also that, recently, Wendell Willkie said he was interested in retaining "the Chinese way of life."

It is a way of life from which Americans should point.

All in all, this Marxian war in which we are indirectly engaged, is a war to reduce the American standard of life to that of the totalitarians and Asiatics.

The entire eight proposals publicized by Mr. Mander, following Lord Halifax' speech, smacks of the philosophy and objectives of British-Israel which is concerned chiefly with world federation.

Lehman Brothers

ONE OF the Lehman brothers is Governor of New York State.

Moreover, these brothers possess mighty holdings in the New York liquor traffic.

These brothers operate an international banking house and so ——

According to the *Chicago Daily News* (April 4), "The Lehman Corporation virtually eliminated its holdings of United States government bonds during the first quarter this year, the Investment Trust's quarterly report disclosed today.

"Holdings of United States government obligations were reduced from $6,800,000 to $800,000 face value, but otherwise the portfolio showed little change in the proportionate amount invested in the major categories of assets. Cash, meanwhile, increased from $2,468,118 to $7,782,279."

Thus, the question is asked: "Why do these foxy internationalists engage in such a liquidation?"

Our surmise is only a surmise. Nevertheless, it seems to us that there is a desire, in dumping United States securities, to secure hard cash to be used in buying war babies.

At all times there has been more profit in merchandising murder than in anything else.

For example, between the years 1910-1914, the yearly earnings of Bethlehem Steel averaged $6-million.

* * *

Following the declaration of the World War, Bethlehem dedicated its factories to munition-making with the result that their yearly earnings averaged, between 1914 and 1918, $49-million.

For five years prior to the first World War, United States Steel averaged a yearly profit of $105-million.

Between 1914-1918 this profit jumped to $240-million per year.

International Nickel Company jumped its profits from $4-million to $73½-million a year — an increase of 1700 per cent — as a result of war profits.

At random we took these instances to indicate how lucrative it is for international bankers to dump national securities and invest their cash in murder merchandise.

Incidentally, the millions of patriotic conscriptees have few bonds to liquidate and few profits to expect.

The same goes for the factory workers and farmers who, following the mad concentration of wealth resultant from war, will see their fools' gold slipping through their fingers through the process of taxation.

And whose war is this? Be it persistently reiterated, it is a war induced by those who hold and control the pot of gold at Fort Knox, Kentucky.

It will not be long before the truth will be known to the public.

And with the known truth, the identity of the merchandisers of murder, together with their intrigues, will be nationally publicized.

It happened in Europe. It will happen here.

Monsignor Ryan Writes a Letter

WE PRESENT a facsimile of a letter signed by Monsignor John A. Ryan, director of the Department of Social Action of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, of which the Most Reverend Edward Mooney, D.D., Archbishop of Detroit, is chairman of the administrative board.

The letter is remarkable, not because it is signed by Monsignor Ryan, but because it is written on the official stationery of the National Catholic Welfare Council and signed by the Monsignor in his official capacity.

It is regrettable that this top Catholic organization persists in retaining as its official spokesman in its Department of Social Action an ecclesiastical Harold Ickes — the man who has won for himself the reputation of the New Deal's official hatchet man.

Both the Monsignor and his political counterpart are contributing tremendous disservice to their respective organizations.

The reprint of the Monsignor's letter speaks for itself — particularly its last paragraph wherein this official of the National Catholic Welfare Conference says there is no indication that this country is drifting into Communism fast; and that whoever makes such a statement is utterly wrong.

For the Monsignor to be guilty of such an egregious and crass error in judgment is regrettable. But for him to cloak his conclusions in the shabby, soiled garment of an Ickesian attack upon SOCIAL JUSTICE, the *Brooklyn Tablet* and the silent Father Coughlin is despicable.

Such persistent affirmations on the part of the Monsignor relative to the absolute drift of Communism and such application by implication of sewer-spawned verbiage as contained in the word "faker" will bring no luster upon the National Catholic Welfare Conference for whom the Monsignor speaks in his official capacity.

We stress the point that he is an official, speaking officially, for the National Catholic Welfare Conference which, by virtue of the word "welfare" should be careful to exclude from its roster of officials any personage whose public words tend to breed dissension. The Monsignor warns his correspondents not to be fooled or frightened by "fakers."

And it is logical for us to assume that SOCIAL JUSTICE, the *Brooklyn Tablet* and Father Coughlin, in this instance, are "fakers" for having stoutly and persistently maintained that this country is drifting into Communism fast.

The saintly Pius XI pleaded with us to be aware of the dangers of Communism.

Cardinal William O'Connell, the Dean of the American hierarchy, warned our country of the danger of Communism.

Archbishop John McNicholas of Cincinnati, insisted upon the same point.

Archbishop Francis Beckman of Dubuque, voiced similar expressions.

Archbishop James Curley of Baltimore and Washington reminded us of the drift towards Communism.

Monsignor Fulton Sheen, Father Charles E. Coughlin and a multitude of priests throughout the nation have pointed out the aggressions being made by Communists.

In such company with these gentlemen and many others of note, are SOCIAL JUSTICE magazine and the *Brooklyn Tablet*, on the question of Communism in America.

Inferentially, they may all be fakers, according to Monsignor Ryan.

The trouble with the moribund Monsignor who, likely, is sincere in his statement, is that he has been so blinded by years of association with radicals and Reds that he can not see the forest for the trees.

Monsignor Ryan's continued presence as an officer in the National Catholic Welfare Conference and his direct and indirect attacks on those who are fighting Communism in this nation — "fakers" to him — may invite repercussions of a character which will not be pleasant in days to come.

There are too many informed persons — Catholics and non-Catholics — in these United States who not only disagree with the Monsignor but who stand ready to oppose him, and the philosophy of Red appeasement for which he has been notorious by deeds, if not by words.

National Catholic Welfare Conference

MOST REV. EDWARD MOONEY, D.D., ARCHBISHOP OF DETROIT, CHAIRMAN, ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD
RIGHT REV. MSGR. MICHAEL J. READY, GENERAL SECRETARY

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL ACTION

MOST REV. EDWIN V. O'HARA, D.D., CHAIRMAN
RIGHT REV. MSGR. JOHN A. RYAN, D.D., DIRECTOR
REV. R. A. MCGOWAN, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
REV. JOHN M. HAYES, S.T.D.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS
1312 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

April 2, 1941

Mr. James J. Kokesh
628 Asbury Street
St. Paul, Minnesota

My dear Mr. and Mrs. Kokesh:

I received your recent letter in which you say that H.R. 1074, if passed, "will destroy our parochial schools." I have just read that Bill and find in it nothing to justify such a fear. All that the Bill proposes is to give federal money to the states to be used for physical education in the schools. That would not destroy or even injure the parochial schools; moreover it would be quite possible to have the Bill amended so that part of the money could be made available for physical education in the parochial schools.

As a matter of fact, the Bill has not the slightest chance of being enacted by this Congress.

Your judgment that "this country is drifting into Communism fast," is utterly wrong. There is no indication of that. You must have been reading Social Justice or the Brooklyn Tablet or recalling some of the wild speeches made by Father Coughlin. Don't let yourselves be fooled or frightened by fakers.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Ryan

Director
Department of Social Action

JAR:MC

Red Flirtation With the Irish

IRISH EYES are smiling these days at the latest antics of the Communist Party.

A recent issue of the *Daily Worker* contained no fewer than 6 pro-Irish articles in what seems to be the opening of a new campaign to woo the sons of Erin over to the side of Joseph Stalin.

The Red newspaper devoted its entire second page to stories and pictures of the Easter riots in Ireland 25 years ago.

On the first page was a dispatch about President Roosevelt's alleged attempts to get the Irish into the war as an ally of Britain.

The editorial section contained a sugary treatise on the "greatness of Ireland" and finished off with a couple of anti-British salvos.

It is hardly likely that the Irish, who have been the sturdiest foes of Communism since its birth in 1917, will be taken in by this new twist in the Red party line.

Only a few years back the same *Daily Worker* was urging the Irish to join with Britain and Moscow in collective security pacts and was vilifying the patriots and advocates of Irish freedom as Nazis and terrorists.

The Irish, moreover, are a Catholic people and they will not forget that Communism is and remains the public enemy number one of Christianity.

The Reds' newly inaugurated effort to recruit Irishmen and American citizens of Irish descent evidently comes as the result of the exodus from the party of thousands of Jews, whose faith in Communism weakened after the Nazi-Soviet alliance.

Most of the Communist dissidents have remained Marxists, but are not ready to rejoin the party until Stalin once again becomes an enemy of Hitler.

Meanwhile, Moscow stooges in America are reduced to wooing their most steadfast enemies in a vain effort to fill their depleted ranks.

Industrial Peace

ONE YEAR ago the 17,000 employes of Endicott-Johnson Corporation of New York voted overwhelmingly against collective bargaining representation by either the C.I.O. or the A.F.L.

Long distinguished for its fair treatment of workers, the Endicott-Johnson firm, which boasts of never having suffered a strike, recently announced a 10 per cent wage increase, expected to total $1,250,000 annually.

The wave of industrial strife sweeping America could have been averted if more employers had emulated the Endicott-Johnson example, and more employes had disavowed Communist and racketeering union leaders.

NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Published by The Social Justice Publishing Co.

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

A 'Must' for War

"OUR FORCES must be prepared for the possibilities of war in many and varied terrains, it being quite uncertain in what part of North or South or Central America, or *even possibly other regions* it ultimately may be necessary to use them in the defense of this country and its possessions."

Commenting upon this unbelievable utterance, *The Detroit Free Press* (April 16) says editorially:

"This, Secretary of War Stimson's statement to Senate defense investigators, is for the record. It is also for the education of the dear, stupid masses who not once have been found worthy of the Administration's confidence or trust in war preparation plans.

"We must be educated slowly. Before the election, the most solemn pledges were made that an expeditionary force would "never" be sent abroad. Next it was "not in the discernible future;" then 'not this year, or next year.' After that, 'if the time comes.' Then 'perhaps,' 'possibly' and 'probably.' Now it is 'must' from Stimson.

"Thus are we softened up. Thus are we conditioned. Thus are we prepared for the last push into Hell. Soon we will hear that we must garrison the mountains of the moon at once; that they are vital to the 'defense of this country and its possessions.' This would be no more fantastic, no more reckless, than Stimson's statement."

Secretary Stimson's speech is in the groove.

Since 1934 this commentator realized the New Deal's determination to wipe Hitlerism from the face of the earth.

It was a determination which was preached into his ears by prominent New Dealers.

It was a determination hidden from the American public and discussed furtively by those who control the destinies of the New Deal.

It was a determination brought to its present disclosure by the aid and comfort tendered to the New Deal by know-it-all idealists who swallowed the honeyed propaganda fed to them from Washington.

Unfortunately, Secretary Stimson knows whereof he speaks.

Our sons "must" prepare for a blood bath outside America.

Our civilians "must" prepare for a blitzkrieg upon their homes.

The misled, misinformed American public can thank the men in high places for the predicament in which we find ourselves.

Jews and Lent

BOTH IN the March 17th and 31st issues of SOCIAL JUSTICE evidence was presented to substantiate the charge that certain Jewish magazines printed articles relative to the abolition of certain lenten practices by Christians.

The *New York Jewish Review* in its April 10th issue whirlpooled itself into a lather of invective because SOCIAL JUSTICE printed the exact words from two Jewish magazines — words from two distinct articles advocating this abolition of lenten practices.

As usual, these journalistic Jezebels refused to face facts, contenting themselves to insinuate that SOCIAL JUSTICE spun out of whole cloth the entire story.

For the information of the unfactual publisher of *The Jewish Review*, we reprint what *The Jewish Spectator* (March, 1941) published.

Therein we read:

"Most Christian theologians and *New Testament* scholars of the progressive school are agreed that Jesus' Jewish contemporaries and compatriots were not responsible for his martyr's death. The 'Good Will Movement' especially is deserving of credit for counteracting and opposing the accusation of the Jews as 'Christ killers.' Yet, so long as the *New Testament* will be taught in Christian schools and read from the pulpit, faithful Christians will associate the word 'Jew' with 'Christ killer' and 'enemy of Christianity.'

"Take, for example, the accounts of the trial and crucifixion of Jesus in the four Gospels, which attach the guilt of Jesus' death to the Jews, exonerating the Roman governor who imposed and executed the sentence. How is it possible for a Christian to read and believe in the truth of these chapters without feeling hatred toward those whom *'Holy Writ'* charges with the guilt for the Savior's death?"

Indeed, *The Jewish Spectator* is not satisfied with getting rid of lent, as the author, previously quoted in *The Jewish Review* desired.

The Jewish Spectator indicates that it would be glad if Christians got rid of the *New Testament*.

Neither *The Jewish Review* nor *The Jewish Spectator* can blame us for the words which we quote.

The words are their's.

And they will remain their's as a lasting record.

No apology would be acceptable from *The Jewish Review*.

Let its editors, like Jezebels, content themselves with painting their own faces, now turned red.

Lend-Lease Stymied?

IT WAS A cute diplomatic trick for Congress to pass the *Lease-Lend Bill* under the whip direction of F.D.R.

Cute, in the sense that it would enable the United States to edge into World War No. 2 without being directly responsible for actual shooting.

The 50 aged destroyers — boats, not men — which we sent abroad; the planes and bombers which we planned to lease, lend or give — these would turn the tide in favor of battered Britain.

That's what F.D.R. thought as, with tongue in cheek, he congratulated himself on the uncanny maneuvers identified with the ultra-smart *Lease-Lend Bill*.

Confucius say, "he who puts tongue in cheek often finds lump in throat."

And the lump came on schedule — April 16th — with the Moscow report indicating that Japan is about to execute a Lease-Lend Bill in favor of Germany.

The Moscow report revealed that the Japanese are in a deal to lend possibly 20 destroyers and 10 cruisers to the Germans.

Should such negotiations mature, it will be too bad for British shipping in the Orient unless F.D.R. decides to lend half our navy to the Australians who, at present, will find difficulty in manning the ships without the help of trained kangaroos.

All in all, it's the old story of the double-edged sword.

Comment

Pay Envelopes and Taxes

TRIAL balloons are already floating over the Capitol advertising the desires on the part of the Government in the matter of taxation.

Specifically, alert Washingtonians are hearing that Mr. Morgenthau's department is planning to tax the pay envelopes of factory workers.

A straight impost of 25 per cent on pay envelopes is rumored in some quarters. In others it is being whispered that the Government is about to appropriate 50 per cent of the cash in pay envelopes and return half of the amount appropriated in bonds which, ten years hence, will amount to 100 per cent of the amount appropriated.

Probably, if such a plan should be adopted by the Treasury Department, pay envelope bonds will not be negotiable with the grocer, the butcher, the landlord and the tailor.

This will mean a period of retrenchment while all workers and their wives wait till ten years will have elapsed before they can indulge in spending money for things they need now.

In this comment it is germane to record the possibility of a huge bond issue against all savings in banks and all wealth represented by insurance policies, stocks and securities.

We mean that it is possible for the Government to commandeer a percentage of the wealth of all persons for the conduct of the war.

Thousands of "smart" persons, anticipating such a move, are beginning to hoard currency.

To what avail? Should currency money in banks or wealth as represented in securities be commandeered, it is always possible for the Government to issue an edict invalidating all currency printed before a given date, thereby forcing money out of hiding.

* * *

"And where will we invest our money?" — that is the question asked by thousands of persons today in corresponding with our editorial office.

Some persons believe it best to buy a modest farm.

The writer of this comment will buy no modest farm — or immodest one — simply because he knows no more about farming than he does about the architecture of the dome of heaven.

Yet, there is the possibility of hiring someone to work the farm for you on shares.

And there is the further possibility of learning something about farming before it is too late.

Whatever eventuates, we can rest assured that there will be more and more taxes.

Our generation and generations to come one day will awaken to the utter failure credited to the New Deal — a New Deal that tried to spend us into prosperity with interest-bearing bond money issued by the Federal Reserve Banks.

It is difficult to advise our readers what to do with their money. In the event of inflation — and some sort of an inflation is inevitable — it is not unsound to buy the necessaries of life before their price tags will be changed to higher levels.

It is not unsound to own a small plot of land — 5 to 10 acres — whereon one could raise his own foodstuffs.

It is not unsound to be in debt if we anticipate that dollar debts will be paid with fifty-cent pieces in days to come.

* * *

And this last suggestion should not be taken in the sense that a man should go in debt when he has no money with which to pay his debts. Successful debtors are those who have plenty of money in their purses but who do not care to use it at the time, preferring to ride on some other person's gasoline and tires.

That kind of debtor is really an investor.

The debtor who simply goes into debt without any wherewithal to meet the obligation is not too wise.

Lehman brothers — according to the comment on page 4—evidently knew what they were doing.

Perhaps the small fry can emulate the mighty international bankers.

In other words, if this commentator had $5,000 in actual cash in his hand; if a debt of $2,500 was owed on the home in which he is living, he would prefer to invest a great portion of his $5,000 in some realty bargain rather than pay off the debt on his own home—and this is said even though a depression is expected following the termination of this war; even though lower prices are anticipated in real estate and factory products.

A day will come when the bonds will demand that we the people, we the debtors, will be forced to pay taxes to honor these bonds.

When that day comes, the Government in power must have recourse to some type of inflation which will multiply dollars and raise prices.

Again we say that our debt cannot be paid with our present dollars. If we can pay our debt with 50-cent pieces instead of with dollar bills, we will be, indeed, fortunate.

Racism

A NEGRO recently appeared before the Civil Service Commission in Washington to apply for a statistician's job open in British-owned Trinidad where the United States is building an air base.

In front of 75 other applicants he was informed by a Commission spokesman that the British government had requested the United States not to "send any Negroes regardless of qualifications."

The story was printed in the *Congressional Record*, which also stated that the population of Trinidad is 90 per cent Negro.

Nevertheless, British and American statesmen still insist that we must go to war against Germany because Nazis persecute racial minorities.

A Sense of Humor Saves Harold Ickes

OUR PRESIDENT has a wonderful sense of humor.

With a twinkle in his eye and a warm, winning smile he can dismiss the most embarrassing questions in a manner that makes the interrogator realize the futility of it all.

Only Senator Wheeler seems to be able to ruffle the President's equanimity.

Illustrative of his composure and wit in the face of disturbing situations is his recent reply to a petition by the Alaskan legislature demanding either the removal of Interior Secretary Harold L. (for Loudmouth) Ickes or transfer of administration of Alaskan affairs to another department of the Government.

The Alaskan assembly charged that Ickes, by his dictatorial, unreasonable actions in directing Alaskan affairs, had botched up things frightfully, and therefore the Alaskans wanted no part of Mr. Ickes henceforth and forever more.

The complaint read in part: "The honorable secretary has fostered fascist-like control of the Matanuska farm colony and the Alaska railroad, skillfully avoiding congressional investigations that our people have repeatedly prayed for.

"He opposes Alaska's delegate to Congress, the honorable Anthony J. Dimond, in almost every endeavor of our representative to have much needed Alaska legislation pass the Congress.

"The interior department is now in such ill repute throughout Alaska, due to the many usurpations and abuses brought about by the influence of the honorable Harold L. Ickes, that nothing but ill will, resentment, stagnation of industry, and general harm to our country will result if Alaska control is continued in the hands of the honorable Harold L. Ickes."

Was the President disturbed by this message? Did he resolve that Harold be officially spanked for playing Little Hitler to our brother Alaskans — many of them transplanted middle western farmers? Did the President consider the gravity of the charges against the New Deal's No. 1 pop-off?

If so, evidence of it is deeply hidden in his reply to the Alaskan body.

In characteristic good humor he wrote the assembly:

"This memorial is a refreshing reminder of the freedom of expression enjoyed in our democracy. The energetic, frank expression of the memorialists is, in itself, the best indication that Alaska need not fear any serious abridgement of democratic procedure.

"I am convinced that should the legislature of Alaska desire to present its views to Secretary Ickes, differences of opinion regarding various problems enumerated in the memorial could be amicably resolved."

In other words, folks, Harold may push you around but just as long as you are permitted to talk about it publicly you're not so bad off. And anyway, if Harold has done you wrong, just let him know you don't like it and he'll certainly be happy to reform.

Yes sir, the President has a wonderful sense of humor.

Comment

Col. Knox Reforms

COLONEL FRANK KNOX, Mr. Roosevelt's Secretary of the Navy, is one of our foremost interventionists. Dissenters, in the words of Harold Ickes, are "fifth columnists who would surrender America to a foreign dictator."

Such patriots as Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, Father Coughlin, Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Senator Gerald Nye, and others, are excoriated by the interventionists for asserting that America should remain aloof from Britain's war; or build a defense of our own so strong that a foreign invasion of this continent would be impossible.

Col. Knox, we repeat, is among the crowd who cry that America's security depends upon the British fleet, that a victorious Germany would, in all likelihood, "invade the United States" at the first opportunity.

This all-aid-to-Britain contingent argues that the Atlantic Ocean is no longer a barrier to invasion, nor is George Washington's warning against foreign entanglements any longer applicable.

Those who oppose this view are "mouthpieces of Hitler." Harold Ickes says so. Frank Knox's *Chicago Daily News* says so.

* * *

With this premise firmly established, let us quote from an article by Col. Frank Knox, which appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly* (July, 1939) and which was reprinted in the *Congressional Record*.

Contrasting England's proximity to the continent of Europe with America's geographical position, Mr. Knox then wrote:

"Our margin of safety is not narrow. Vast oceans intervene between us and possible enemies, whether they come from the east or from the west.

"Even in the event of wholly unexpected developments in aerial navigation, it will never be possible to make a decisive attack upon us by air. The worst we have to fear from that direction would be isolated raids of no real military significance.

"We can therefore take for our own the historic British formula for security. Achieving and maintaining a superiority over any enemy or combination of enemies on the high seas, we can make ourselves safe from attack and keep the entire western world secure against the totalitarians.

"The readiness with which the American public has accepted proposals for rapid expansion of our sea power, and the unanimous fashion in which these proposals have been treated by Congress, attest to the universality of this point of view."

Mr. Knox further pointed out America's disillusionment in several attempts at settling foreign problems. "The net effect of all this," he commented, "has been to drive in on the American consciousness with renewed vigor and convincing emphasis, the wisdom of George Washington's warnings to his fellow countrymen upon the eve of his withdrawal from public affairs against involvement in European quarrels.

"So general has this feeling among Americans become that I dare say no proposal could be submitted to the American people to which a more nearly unanimous negative answer would be made than to the question, 'Do you want to send another army to Europe and fight in another of Europe's wars?' "

* * *

At another point Knox again voiced sentiments identical to those isolationists who today are being attacked vilely as "Nazi propagandists," "traitors" and "appeasers."

"There has never been a successful attempt," Col. Knox wrote, "to deny that the *Treaty of Versailles* was a monumental act of bad faith. It utterly ignored the implied promises of President Wilson's 'fourteen points.' It exacted reparations expressly designed to be impossible of satisfaction. It was not in any sense a negotiated peace. It was a victor's peace imposed upon a vanquished foe.

"That it contained the seeds of future wars the history of the past 20 years and the present crisis abundantly prove.

"It is to the eternal credit of the United States Senate that it saved us from the ignominy of ratification of such an instrument of international double-crossing. Thus began our process of disillusionment."

The above opinions of Col. Knox were expressed, you understand, only two months before Great Britain declared war on Germany and then found she needed America's help to stave off defeat.

They also preceded Knox's appointment to the Cabinet of President Roosevelt, from which perch he now sings the Save-England-and-Avoid-Invasion theme song of the internationalists.

The Colonel must be terribly, terribly happy these days—now that he isn't a "fifth columnist" any more.

Purge Hangs Fire

HERBERT A. O'BRIEN is a New York City Judge, a fighting Christian and a leader of the keep-out-of-war movement.

That such a man should continue to serve on the municipal bench and be supported by the city treasury is unbearable to the pro-Soviet La Guardia Administration, the war band of Wall Street and Bronx anti-Christians.

Accordingly, William J. Murray, an old Tammany wheelhorse, was delegated recently to offer a resolution in the New York State Legislature asking that Judge O'Brien be removed from his post on the following grounds:

(1) That he has been a promoter of dissension along racial and religious lines, "and has engaged in activities tending to incite riot."

(2) That "his language has been intemperate and undignified."

(3) That "he has lent his high title of Judge as a touch of respectability for organizations and purposes of the shabbiest, most demagogic character."

The resolution was placed in the hands of the Senate Judiciary Committee, whose chief is Senator Benjamin F. Feinberg of Buffalo.

Friends and supporters of Judge O'Brien have demanded that the resolution be brought out on the floor of the Legislature for open debate.

Albany politicians, however, prefer to keep the fight against O'Brien secret.

They realize that if their attempted purge were brought before the public, there might be a Christian reaction which would sweep out the purgers instead of the purged.

Horrendous Harold

SPEAKING in Chicago (April 13) Harold Ickes smeared as "Nazi fellow travelers" and "Hitler stooges" practically every person in these United States who opposed our entrance into the European war.

When we consider that a reputable poll shows 83 per cent of the people are on the side of the leaders who want to keep the country out of war, Ickes tirade is noteworthy insofar as it indicates a "to-hell-with-the-people" attitude on the part of a war-mongering Administration.

Ickes and his breed drool at the lips with praise for the Marxists and curses for the Nazis.

Therefore, the speech which he made on Easter Sunday — the Feast of the Resurrection of Christ — before a Jewish congregation — brought no credit to the sponsors who engaged the services of this amateur Goebbels. He only soured the sweetness of the day with his Munchausen turpitudes which are more than sufficient to discredit any Administration.

Commenting upon his bombastic brayings, the *Chicago Daily Tribune* (April 15) said:

"Mr. Ickes has some of the physical as well as the mental characteristics of Herr Goebbels, the Nazi minister of propaganda. He has all of the Nazi's intolerance for an opposing opinion, much of the Goebbels vocabulary, and lacks only opportunity to deal with victims summarily. He can only attribute dishonesty to people more honest than himself and turpitude to persons of better minds and higher principles.

"We'll imitate Herr Ickes long enough to remark that a stinkpot sometimes burns itself out. We'll venture to imitate his method of public discussion further, as follows:

"Chicago has known Mr. Ickes for a long time. To his fellow members of the bar he was a lawyer who couldn't earn his living at his profession for lack of clients with confidence in his character and his learning. On La Salle street he was known as a petty gambler in the grain markets. In his suburban community he speculated in village lots. Since 1933 Mr. Ickes has been collecting $15,000 a year from the government, but has managed to buy himself a large and showy Maryland estate.

Who's Who

SOME years ago, in between striptease routines, Frank Reynolds used to regale audiences with his vulgarity in burlesque houses from Boston to San Francisco.

Today under the high-sounding name of Dr. Francis T. Reynolds the same man serves as President of the Anti-Nazi League of America, with offices on Fifth Avenue, New York City.

"Doctor" Reynolds' rise is almost as spectacular as that of another striptease impresario, Sol Bloom, who 40-odd years ago was the manager of the notorious dancer, "Little Egypt," and who is now Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Comment

Scare of the Week

Hitler to Capture America via Texas!

"THE United States should be at war with Germany right now," says the noted educator, Dr. Edwin F. Gay of Pasadena, California.

The eminent doctor, sometimes called the "dean of American economic historians," aired his views on the war and other matters in an address at the fourth annual seminar of the Alumni Association of the California Institute of Technology.

"The sooner the United States is at war with Germany the better," he declared.

Unlike most of those who advocate America's active participation in the European conflict, Dr. Gay does not paint the usual picture of America suddenly awakening some morning to see the swastika fluttering atop the White House and German parachutists landing on every American roof.

No, Dr. Gay does not fear such an invasion; but he's for war just the same.

"I do not believe that Hitler would proceed to conflict with the United States," he confesses. "It would not serve his ends."

The doctor presents what is to us at least a brand new theory regarding the Hitler peril. He sees the great open spaces of Texas as der fuehrer's springboard for subjugating America!

Of course the doctor concedes that this sounds fantastic, and hastens to add that he has some doubts about the plan himself.

Nevertheless he is inclined to place a degree of credence in this latest scare, for it seems that Hitler sprang the idea on Goering, and Goering told Fritz Thyssen, erstwhile German industrial tycoon, and Thyssen told another man, and that man passed it on to Dr. Gay, who relayed it to his California audience.

The plan involves, said the doctor, a five to ten year "softening process" to be accomplished through the medium of propaganda, unemployment and high taxes in the United States. When Americans are partially "softened," five-million to 10-million European colonists would be landed in Texas. Within three years the immigrants would have completed the "softening" job so effectively that Hitler would then be able to take over the entire nation!

"Churches and cowardly business men" would assist der fuehrer in negotiating the coup, said Dr. Gay, without explaining why they could be counted upon to do so or why churches and cowardly business men should be linked together as plotters against their own liberties.

Discussing America's participation in the war, Dr. Gay said there was no doubt in his mind that a Nazi victory over England would mean that the United States would lose to Germany its trade with the southern half of South America.

"This is our war . . . and so the sooner we're in it, the better. We can't remain an arsenal of democracy. If we go to war we should see it through, and not make the same mistake of avoiding our responsibilities that we did before. Unless a closer cooperation of English-speaking peoples emerges from the present conflict the war will be repeated every generation."

We wouldn't embarrass the doctor by asking whether he, himself, is ready and willing to have his head blown off in the war, but we do pose the question: if we must fight trade competitors why not begin with Great Britain, our greatest commercial rival?

As for the invasion of Texas by 5-million or 10-million Europeans, we hope the doctor does not lie awake nights wondering how they would get there.

English Invasion—1839; A 'Precedent' Backfires

THE research department of the United States Attorney General's office has spent considerable time rummaging through dusty tomes for historical precedents to justify and legalize this nation's all-out aid to Great Britain.

One of the most interesting of their discoveries was that which apparently legalized the *Lease-Lend Bill*.

Ironically, the situation cited as a parallel to present conditions, was one in which President Van Buren sought extraordinary powers to *repel the British from America*.

In 1839 English troops under Sir John Harvey invaded northern Maine, with orders to take forcible possession of all lands claimed by the British Crown.

The governor of Maine mobilized the state militia and dispatched it to oppose the invasion. He then appealed to President Van Buren for Federal troops.

Although both opponents and protagonists of the British-aid bill referred to the War of 1812 as the last British invasion of the United States, history records this incident of 1839. Possibly because the British were then involved as a foe of America, proponents of the *Lease-Lend* measure did not emphasize too strongly the "precedent" of 1839 which they cited in support of the bill.

What the President and Congress did in the 1839 emergency was described by John Van Buren, a relative of the eighth President, at a meeting in New York City during the Civil War crisis.

Arguing in favor of a bill which conferred near-dictatorial powers on President Lincoln, Van Buren declared:

"As to the bill which gives President Lincoln power over the sword and purse, I agree it makes him almost a dictator. I agree that it is a very great stretch of power. I agree that unless there be a great necessity for it, it should not be done. Everybody knows that in prosecuting a war under a republican government which consists of several states, the great apprehension is that there may not be unity on the part of the states sufficient to import energy to the national executive head. That was predicated as one of the grounds upon which this system of government would fail."

Then Mr. Van Buren described the invasion of Maine and outlined the provisions of the bill which Congress had once passed to show Great Britain that it proposed to fight and resist invasion.

The first section of the measure put the whole military and naval force of the United States and the state militia under the complete control of the President. Other parts of the bill authorized the President to call out 50,000 volunteers, and to expend $10-million in carrying out provisions of the act.

This threat of war against Great Britain had its desired effect. General Winfield Scott went to Maine and forced the British to withdraw. The matter was settled in agreement signed by the British on March 24, 1839.

The following December President Van Buren reported to Congress: "The extraordinary powers vested in me by act of Congress for the defense of the country in an emergency considered so far probable as to require that the Executive should possess ample means to meet it, have not been exerted. They have, therefore, been attended with no other result than to increase, by the confidence reposed in me, my obligations to maintain, with religious exactness, the cardinal principles that govern our intercourse with other nations."

Opponents of the *Lease-Lend Bill* could have used this so-called historical and legal precedent to advantage, for the address of President Van Buren is a straight-forward answer to those clamoring for dictatorial powers for the present Chief Executive.

Van Buren emphasized that he had not used his extraordinary powers because he feared the consequences. On the other hand, President Roosevelt, even prior to its passage, had employed dictatorial powers given him under the *Lease-Lend Bill*.

Emergency powers were granted Van Buren to repel an actual invasion of America and he hesitated to use them.

Emergency powers are granted to President Roosevelt, and used extensively, not to repulse an invasion of America, but to defend Great Britain.

This is the same Great Britain that has invaded America three times, and threatened to do so again in 1863 via Mexico; a nation that gave aid to the Confederacy in the Civil War in the hope of splitting the Union and opening at least the southern part of the United States to British domination.

By resurrecting one of the generally unknown chapters of American history as a historical precedent for the lease-lend action, the Attorney General's office indicated it was hard pressed to find any event which would justify the Administration course.

Actually the citation provides stronger argument for those opposed to current policies than those advocating them.

Stranded Americans

DR. J. DUNNING, an American physician who recently returned from London to the United States by clipper plane, recently told a large audience at the Los Angeles Breakfast Club that 2,000 Americans are stranded in England.

"A few months ago those Americans were comfortably situated," the doctor said, "but now they have lost everything and are without food or money.

"It seems strange," he continued, "that this great nation is sending great sums of money and supplies to distressed citizens of other nations and has failed to provide for its own nationals in Britain."

Just Another 'Glorious' Achievement

British Democracy as Seen in Newfoundland

To AMERICANS the recent landing of U. S. troops in Newfoundland had no other significance than the routine acquisition of one of the defense bases leased from Britain in return for 50 United States destroyers.

To the Irish, Scotch and English natives of this 42,734-square-mile island off Canada's east coast, however, it was a day of rejoicing.

They looked upon the khaki-clad American soldiers not as unwelcome strangers or invaders, but as Newfoundland's potential liberators. For since 1934 the island has been at the mercy of an iron-fisted British dictatorship.

According to an article by Walter Davenport in *Colliers Magazine*, "were Newfoundland permitted to vote upon it, eighty per cent of the inhabitants would ask the United States to take them over."

Mr. Davenport declared that the island, which is designed to be the "strongest outpost of Western democracy," has no voice in its government, no free public school system, a fantastic lack of sanitation and medical facilities, and totally inadequate housing.

Fifty thousand Newfoundlanders are on relief (at six cents a day); more than one-half of the population is illiterate; and almost one-third of Newfoundland's 300,000 people have tuberculosis.

Laborers are so poorly paid that, while negotiations were being made for the construction of an air base, Britain requested the United States not to pay workers more than 25c an hour for fear of upsetting the island's economy.

Unskilled laborers get as little as $6 a month; clerical workers from $3 to $6 a week; fishermen, who make up one-fifth of the entire population, have an annual wage of about $150, much of which has to go to pay off mortgages on their boats and equipment.

So widespread is Newfoundland's poverty that when the natives were told that Americans had come to defend the island against a Hitler invasion they burst out laughing.

They were unable to believe that Hitler would want to conquer such poor pickings as Newfoundland, and if he did they could not imagine Nazi tryanny being any worse than Britain's.

The cause of Newfoundland's present plight can be directly traced to various repressive measures adopted by the British Empire in the course of the last three centuries.

Writing in *Donahue's Magazine*, March, 1907, the Reverend Edward F. Curran stated: "Under Charles I, a Star Chamber order of 1633 prohibited all ships from carrying any persons to the Island other than those engaged in the fishery.

By the efforts of these men colonization was so thwarted that instead of having a population today of millions (which the country could support) it has only 280,000.

Irishmen, Father Curran related, who came to the island in the 17th and 18th centuries to escape persecution only found themselves "out of the frying pan into the fire."

Because one priest dared to celebrate Mass, Governor Dorrill (1755-56) ordered every building in which Mass had been said to be burned to the ground.

It wasn't until 1784 that religious freedom was established in the island and Catholics, who today comprise 32 per cent of the population, given the right to worship without fear of reprisals.

Early in the 20th century, Britain indiscriminately gave fishing rights in Newfoundland to other nations regardless of protests of the natives.

Concerning this unwarranted assault on the Newfoundlanders' chief livelihood, Rev. Curran wrote: "No one need be astonished at this, seeing that a theatrical nincompoop like Winston Churchill is second in command at the Colonial office."

After the World War, in which 1,400 Newfoundlanders gave up their lives, the island was made a Dominion of the British Empire. But by 1933, when natives were unable to pay off a $90,000 debt, Britain offered to "save" the island, provided it gave up its newly won measure of independence and resubmitted to British rule.

Newfoundlanders, caught in the financial web of Threadneedle Street, could do nothing but agree.

London then sent over three commissioners who ruled the island in the manner of Persian satraps. One of them, a Mr. Lodge, was so outraged by the undemocratic methods employed by his colleagues that in 1939 he resigned in disgust and wrote a book entitled "Dictatorship in Newfoundland."

Revealing that the island was both politically and economically poorer than it had been before the return of British tyranny, Mr. Lodge wrote:

"To have abandoned the principle of democracy without accomplishing economic rehabilitation is surely the unforgivable sin."

The future of Newfoundland is hopeless as long as the present British commissioners remain in power. But since America has acquired a 99-year lease for bases on the island, Newfoundlanders themselves have taken a new lease on life.

It might be a good idea for the United States to bring democracy to Newfoundland — where the inhabitants want it — before trying to bestow it on totalitarian-minded nations in Europe and Asia.

Those Cagey People

DON'T ever underestimate British business acumen.

Great Britain declared war on Germany without consulting the United States and before securing any encouragement or promise of assistance from this Government.

At least, our Administration has so declared, in defending itself against charges that American diplomats did promise aid.

After purchasing $2-billion, 700-million worth of war materials in this country, Britain then announced she was "broke" — could buy no more.

Whereupon the United States was persuaded to assume Britain's war financing, and, as a starter, appropriated $7-billion — more than 2½ times the amount that allegedly "broke" Britain.

Further appropriations will be made as the need arises.

The American public is to be taxed to the hilt to pay for a war in defense of the British Empire and the world order of gold capitalism controlled by the British internationalists.

It has long been known that Britain loves to have other nations fight its battles. Now it has the United States *paying* for them as well.

Ireland

WHAT will be the fate of Ireland?

The United States having approved the repudiated ambassador from Denmark, who signed the necessary document, took over Greenland.

Political retaliation is in the offing. Either Great Britain or Germany will attempt to take over Ireland to offset the checkerboard move made in Greenland.

So comes the report to our offices.

We trust and pray that the European war will have been decided before Ireland will have been invaded by the Germans — the Ireland already invaded by the British.

President Eamon De Valera said (April 13):

"Death and suffering we shall not be able to avoid if we are attacked," he said, "but we shall be certain that they will not be in vain by completing and perfecting the organization and training of our manhood in several national services.

"If we have to take up arms — we shall know the cause is just.

"I many times have warned you of the dangers which threaten us. Although we wish well to all peoples, have no desire to quarrel with any, we proclaimed our neutrality and made our will so manifest no one could mistake it."

De Valera's broadcast followed a martial display in tribute to the men, who, during Easter Week 25 years ago, took up arms to protect the Irish Republic.

An English Scholar Pleads for Justice

AMID the babble of hate and destructionism now being preached in London by the men in control of the British government, at least one voice has been raised, pleading for a just and lasting settlement of world problems in the event the Allies should win the war.

The voice is that of Arthur Wynne Morgan Bryant, Oxford graduate, World War veteran, one-time instructor of history at London University and one of Britain's most prominent educators and writers.

It speaks in the pages of a book entitled, "Unfinished Victory" published by Macmillan and Co., Ltd., of London, and calls upon Britons to lay aside all hatred and prejudice after the war so that a fair and honorable peace can be concluded with Germany, without whose co-operation the rebuilding of Europe would be impossible.

Although several of Mr. Bryant's previous books have been printed in the United States, "Unfinished Victory" so far has not been able to find an American publisher.

The reason: in discussing German problems since 1918 Mr. Bryant is undiplomatic enough to mention the Jews and to hold them partly responsible for the chaos which gave birth to Naziism.

The thesis of Mr. Bryant's book is clearly stated in his introduction.

"Last time," he writes, "as a result of vast effort and sacrifice we won victory. But we did not win peace. We failed because we never took enough trouble to do so.

"The last peace was not worthy of the men who died to win it. For it did not endure and therefore robbed them of their victory.

As a patriotic Englishman, Mr. Bryant hopes that his countrymen will gain another victory. But this time he wants a complete victory — not only a victory in war, but a victory in peace as well.

To the author a peace victory means a peace treaty agreed to by both sides, not one forced upon Germany at the point of a gun. History has proved that a treaty like Versailles doesn't end wars; it guarantees their continuation.

But just and honorable treaties can never be made between two nations without mutual goodwill and understanding. For this reason Mr. Bryant devotes a good portion of his book to a resume of German post-war history.

Hitler is shown to be an effect, not a cause. The rise of Naziism was only made possible by the trials and tribulations of the German people during the post-World War years, when Britain and France refused to make any real settlement with the peaceable German Republic.

Nazidom would never have come into being were it not for the bankruptcy, inflation, military occupations and near-Communism forced upon Germany by the harsh peace terms and political acts of the Allies.

Mr. Bryant asks his countrymen not to hate and condemn all Germans for the Nazi persecution of the Jews without first considering what the Jews had done to Germans in 1918-33.

"Many of the leaders of the Communist revolution in both countries (Germany and Russia) were Jews," Mr. Bryant writes. "They were not always squeamish in the methods they advocated."

Mr. Bryant then tells how the Jews profited during the inflation because they were able to get money from relatives living abroad.

"By purchasing the assets of his neighbors . . . he (the Jew) was able, before the debacle ended, to buy up enough real property in Germany to make him a rich man."

The Jews did this "with such effect that, even in November, 1938, after 5 years of anti-Semitic legislation and persecution, they still owned, according to the *Times* correspondent in Berlin, something like one-third of the real property in the Reich."

After discussing how the Jews gained control of practically all the German banks and how their influence in public opinion, politics and cultural life grew out of all proportion to their number, the author turned to the Jewish attack on Christianity.

"The beliefs in Christianity . . . became an object of undisguised scorn among the German intelligentsia. A poet, lauded as great by a Social Democratic Minister for Culture, could not describe a cat caterwauling on the roof at night without an insulting comparison to 'the Lord of the Garden of Gethsemane.'

"The most acclaimed biographer in Germany depicted Christ as an emotional if amiable sentimentalist, hypnotised by his own self-imposed mission and rehashing as something new ancient Jewish doctrines while he indulged his tastes for heady wine and headier female flattery.

"Both writers were Jews."

Book publishers and mass-circulation periodicals cannot print these facts in the United States because of the pressure of minority groups.

Until they are known to the people at large, however, there can be no foundation for a lasting peace.

Arrivals

AMONG recent arrivals in New York on the *S.S. Exeter* from Lisbon were fourteen Wolfs, all members of a rich, Luxembourg textile-mill family.

Like some 15 Rothschilds, who fled to America last Summer after the Nazi invasion of France, the Wolfs had little trouble obtaining *visas* to the United States.

The Atlantic Ocean has become a broad highway for the alien Wolfs and Rothschilds these days, while hundreds of American citizens have been forced to stay in Lisbon as long as eight months, unable to obtain berths on the refugee-jammed transoceanic liners.

Graft in Defense

THE war profiteers are in a fair way to make millions of dollars of blood money.

And the grafters probably will make their share.

Disclosures of two government land acquisition scandals agitated Congress recently and caused the House Rules Committee to approve an investigation by the military and naval affairs committees.

Republican Congressman, Albert J. Engel of Michigan already has conducted a one man investigation probe into the costs of army camp construction.

A week ago he presented the first of a series of findings startling to the House.

The House Military Affairs Committee was told of an improper land purchase which hinted at graft in the War Department itself.

Brigadier General Somervell and attorney John J. O'Brien already have revealed that they have asked the Justice Department to look into the Missouri land deal which promises to cost the taxpayers millions of dollars of graft money; and it is alleged that R. Newton McDowell, a Kansas City, Missouri, agent stood to obtain a $150,000 fee plus a $40,000 fee for the Kansas City Title Insurance company.

* * *

The American public still remembers the scandals uncovered after the World War, when it was disclosed that not only wanton waste but corruption as well crept into the procurement and production of war materials.

Representative Leo E. Allen of Illinois, a member of the Rules Committee, recalled a few World War blunders which went unnoticed until revealed by a Congressional investigation.

Mr. Allen said that although the Government spent $1,191,000,000 for artillery during the war, General Pershing stated that 109 75 mm. guns and 24 8-inch howitzers were the only large American-produced artillery pieces received in France.

Approximately $1,051,000,000 was spent on aircraft, Allen continued, but General Pershing is also the authority for the statement that the American Army was wholly dependent upon the Allies for airplanes.

Of course the failure of more artillery and airplanes to reach the front was due in a large degree to our unpreparedness for producing them.

But that does not explain why the War Department bought 945,000 saddles, 1-million sets of double harness, 1,637,197 horse brushes 2,029,418 feed bags, 2,850,-853 halters and 195,000 branding irons—all for equipping a total of only 391,000 horses and mules.

"Let's stop a repetition of tremendous waste like that," Allen urged. "There is every evidence that the Army is already making purchases on a grandiose scale with the billions we are furnishing them."

Wars always come to an end.

And when this war ends, it will be the end of the present Administration, many of whose agents will be called upon to give an accounting.

Comment

The C.I.O. and Reds

SOCIAL JUSTICE — not facetiously — again asks the question: "Where are those gentlemen who campaigned for their followers to join the C.I.O.?"

Their silence is ominous — or something.

At least, they should be out in front courageously trying to rid the C.I.O. of its Red-headed leaders.

Or, if they are satisfied that such a cause is hopeless, they should be pointing out to their flocks in the same stentorian voice used on previous occasions, that the excesses of the C.I.O. are not to be condoned.

Possibly, they know more about the whole situation than does Martin Dies.

Possibly, Mr Dies' findings might be of use to them.

Thus, we reprint a speech made by the Honorable Representative from Texas in the House of Representatives on Thursday, March 27th.

Said he:

Communist Leadership in Labor Unions
Speech of
HON. MARTIN DIES
of Texas
in the House of Representatives
Thursday, March 27, 1941

Mr. DIES: "Mr. Speaker, the shocking revelation that the strike at the Allis-Chalmers plant was called as a result of a fraudulent ballot should occasion no surprise. We have been calling the attention of this House to the Communist leadership in that strike. We have informed the House that Harold Christoffel, president of the Allis-Chalmers striking local of the Automobile Workers Union, has a record of Communist affiliation. There was nothing extraordinary in the fact that a trade-union local under such leadership cast 2,200 fraudulent ballots when the strike vote was taken. That sort of thing will continue to occur as long as Communist leadership is tolerated in labor unions. Fraud is one of the methods frequently employed by the Communist Party to attain its ends.

"We have also called attention to the fact that the Communist Party is bent upon a course of obstruction to defeat the national defense program for which this House is appropriating billions of dollars. We may expect a mounting wave of strikes in our key industries. We may expect a mounting wave of violence in connection with these strikes. We may expect repeated instances of fraud. These things are the natural fruit of Communist leadership in labor unions. For almost 3 years the C.I.O. has refused to take any action looking toward the removal of Communists from its leadership. On the contrary, the C.I.O. has defended its Communist leadership in a dozen of its constituent unions.

"In this connection, it is pertinent to call attention once more to an organization which calls itself the American Peace Mobilization. A recent investigation by our staff convinces me that the peace mobilization is simply a front for the Communist Party. It is more completely Communist in its complexion and control than was the American League for Peace and Democracy. The American League flourished in the period of the People's Front, and was able, therefore, to conceal its Communist control more successfully than is the case with the American Peace Mobilization. This latter organization belongs to the period of collaboration between Stalin and Hitler, and this fact stamps it more clearly as an instrument of the foreign policy of the 'red' dictator. The American Peace Mobilization has a single aim, and that aim is to defeat the program of national defense. That is likewise the aim of the Communist Party.

"The thousands of innocents who were hoodwinked into aiding the American League for Peace and Democracy are not to be found in the American Peace Mobilization. The Peace Mobilization's objectives are too plain on the surface to allow innocents to be misled.

"The outstanding facts about the American Peace Mobilization is the support which it receives from the Communist-dominated unions in the C.I.O. It is this C.I.O. support which makes the American Peace Mobilization a sinister force in the country today.

"A few weeks ago the Daily Worker listed the names of the C.I.O. leaders who are backing the American Peace Mobilization. Those names belong in the *Record*. They go a long way toward explaining the wave of strikes and violence that now jeopardizes our national defense program. Here are the C.I.O. leaders who are, according to the Daily Worker, behind the program of the American Peace Mobilization:

"Reid Robinson, president of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers of America, a man with a very long record of affiliation with the front organizations of the Communist Party. Robinson is a vice president of the C.I.O.

"Michael J. Quill, president of the Transport Workers Union, about whose membership in the Communist Party there can be little doubt.

"George C. Peacock, president of the National Association of Die Casters, whose union carried on the strike at the Harvill plant in Inglewood, Calif., under the leadership of Kenneth Eggert and Ralph Dawson, two Communist Party members of public record.

"Lewis Alan Berne, president of the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians, a union whose national organizer, Marcel Scherer, ran for office on the Communist Party ticket.

"E. F. Burke, secretary of the National Marine Cooks' and Stewards' Association, a union under the complete control of Harry Bridges.

"Abraham Flaxer, president of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, a man with a long record of affiliation with Communist Party front organizations.

"Ben Gold, president of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union, an avowed member of the Communist Party.

"Donald Henderson, president of the United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America, an avowed member of the Communist Party.

"J. F. Jurich, president of the International Union of Fishermen and Allied Workers of America, another Bridges' union.

"Mat Meehan, secretary of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, Bridges' own union.

"Lewis Merrill, president of the United Office and Professional Workers of America, a union which our committee found to be under Communist control.

"Frederick N. Myers, general organizer of the National Maritime Union, about whose Communist Party membership there can be no doubt, and a man with a serious criminal record under another name.

"Grant W. Oakes, chairman of the Farm Equipment Workers Organizing Committee and leader of the strike at the plants of International Harvester, the man who so recently threatened wholesale violence in this strike.

"O. M. Ortin, president of the Woodworkers of America.

"Joseph Selly, president of the American Communications Association. Selly has under his supervision at least half a dozen short-wave radio stations operated by members of his union. Selly has recently been appointed a member of the Labor Advisory Board for Defense Communications.

"All of the foregoing prominent leaders of the C.I.O. are announced as supporters of the American Peace Mobilization. I reiterate the question: What are you, Mr. Philip Murray, going to do about this Communist leadership in the C.I.O.?"

The foregoing speech is a strong indictment of those fabulous leaders and gentlemen who were famous for joining popular front movements such as the American League for Peace and Democracy.

We who stand for peace mobilization do not approve of the Communist infiltration into its ranks — an infiltration designed to capture the leadership of the movement.

The Dies speech which we reproduced is worthwhile re-reading, if for no other purpose than to learn the litany of names associated with the radicalism operating under the banner of the C.I.O.

Canada's Prime Minister Speaks

ACCORDING to the *New York Times* (April 7), Prime Minister W. L. MacKenzie King warned his fellow countrymen against "facile optimism and exaggerated expectations."

He foresaw the possibility of Germany's becoming the arsenal of a consolidated Europe.

He foresaw the possibility of America's becoming isolated by the rest of the world.

He foresaw the possibility of America's being forced to adopt totalitarian methods in order to survive.

And he foresaw the possibility of Britain's not winning the battle of the Atlantic.

Well, the Prime Minister is realistic. He is simply voicing what SOCIAL JUSTICE foresaw months ago — years ago — when it pleaded with this Government to stay out of the European war.

History will recognize that Chamberlain's appeasement policy was perfectly sound under the circumstances of unpreparedness on the part of France and England.

France and England, like the United States, were infested by Communists and Communist supporters who were responsible for unpreparedness because they loved Joe Stalin more than they did either John Bull or Uncle Sam.

When the Anthony Edens abroad and the Bullitts at home campaigned for "war now," they were campaigning for Karl Marx.

And history will vindicate this assertion.

Comment

Legislating Bigotry

Phelps Bill Dead; Wire From Author

SOCIAL JUSTICE is in receipt of the following telegram from Phelps Phelps, state senator from the 13th district of New York, and author of the Phelps Bill discussed in the April 7 issue of this publication:

"Editor, SOCIAL JUSTICE:

"Let me assure you that the sole purpose of the bill I introduced at this session (of the New York legislature) and which you discuss in SOCIAL JUSTICE of April 7, had but one purpose — the frustration and defeat of the disloyalists active in the German Bund, the Communistic organizations and other disruptive, hate-promoting subversive societies.

"Your interpretation of the section penalizing the dissemination of 'any picture, photograph, emblem, representation, sign or token which in any way incites, counsels, promotes, advocates or symbolizes hatred, violence or hostility against any group or groups of persons residing or being in this state, by reason of race, color, religion or manner of worship' as a prohibition of the use of prayer beads or other holy Catholic relics astonished me.

"How could these blessed representations of the Church promote anything but brotherly love as taught by Christ Himself?

"Every sector of the bill is directed against ugly hate and un-American activity.

"The proposal in its entirety was patterned after a New Jersey statute under which nine Bundists were convicted, a law held constitutional in that state.

"My surprise was heightened by the fact that my record in voting for every Catholic proposal directed at Nazis, Communists and Kluxers and others is absolutely without a blemish. Moreover, I voted for the bill providing bus transportation for Catholic children, which Governor Lehman vetoed, and the measure which he subsequently signed; against the so-called 'Youth Control Bill,' which the Catholic organizations opposed; in favor of the welfare law providing care for crippled Catholic children; every other measure supported by the Church organizations.

"Opposition arising largely from misconception and misinterpretation of the bill, which I assure you was motivated by a determination to counteract the forces of subversion and disunity, has persuaded me that education is the one effective means by which we can accomplish such a result.

"So persuaded, I permitted the bill to die in committee.

"I agree with you that we can hardly legislate tolerance. Enlightenment, truly, is the only effective means, and that only through education such as the Church provides, in contrast to so many institutions countenancing the spread of anti-Americanism from the classroom.

"I assure you my motives were wholly American, assertively anti-radical.

(signed) "Phelps Phelps,
State Senator, 13th District,
New York."

If SOCIAL JUSTICE has done Mr. Phelps an injustice the editors offer their sincere apologies.

The criticism of the measure which appeared in the April 7 issue was based upon the loopholes in the proposal, not necessarily upon the intent of the author.

SOCIAL JUSTICE readily concedes Mr. Phelps' point that rosary beads and other "blessed representations of the Church" could not possibly promote racial hatred. The April 7 comment took this into consideration, declaring that "while every informed person knows that nothing in the liturgy of the Christian faith is intended to incite hatred of any race, non-Christians might construe certain statements in religious prayerbooks as 'tending to incite hostility' against them."

Witness, for example, the recent articles in Jewish publications, denouncing the "anti-Semitism" of the New Testament, and calling for Christian abandonment of Lent because of its "tragic implications."

However, Mr. Phelps cites a splendid record to prove his good faith in the matter. It appears, therefore, that the fault of the bill lay in its loose construction, which the author inferentially admits bred "opposition arising largely from misconception and misinterpretation."

No fair-minded person, Jew or Gentile, approves of bigotry.

But legislators must recognize the dangers of attempting to outlaw bigotry by statutes which infringe on freedom of speech, freedom of the press and freedom of assembly.

Smart lawyers can twist the meaning of laws to suit their own purposes and courts frequently are forced to rule in accordance with specious arguments which have enough legal support to be binding.

Commenting on an "anti-bigotry" bill introduced recently in Maryland, the cradle of America's traditional religious tolerance, the *Baltimore Sun* recalls, "It has been said that Fascism would come to America, if at all, in the guise of anti-Fascism."

Asserting that "it is silly to expect Fascism in any form in America," the *Sun* observes nevertheless that there is a kernel of truth in that "flippant paradox" about Fascism appearing in the guise of anti-Fascism.

That kernel of truth, the *Sun* declares, "is indicated by a bill just introduced into the General Assembly.

"*H. B. 291* would prohibit propaganda or acts inciting to racial or religious hatred. It would make it illegal in any way to 'set up and make legible in any language' any book, speech, statement or pamphlet advocating discrimination on grounds of race, color, religion or form of worship.

"The bill would outlaw organizations having constitutions or by-laws which promoted religious or racial hostility. It would forbid meetings for such purposes, and a meeting would be any coming together of three or more persons. Signs, emblems and photographs tending to foment hostility would come under the ban.

"Owners of halls, theaters or broadcasting stations or distributing agents which lent themselves to the dissemination of the forbidden doctrines would be liable to punishment. And, just to plug up any remaining loopholes, *H. B. 291 would make it illegal to voice in private conversation any of the thoughts laid out in the statute as dangerous to the public safety.*

"No one will deny that thoughts tending to generate racial or religious hatred are dangerous. No one will deny that statements and organizations devoted to such ends can be a peril to the public peace. But no one can argue that present laws of libel, present State and Federal statutes for the control of subversion, the registration of organizations suspected of having foreign ties, etc., leave the country altogether unprotected against the evils of bigotry.

"Bigotry is an evil. But all men do not agree on what constitutes bigotry, and while *H. B. 291* couldn't possibly suppress bigotry it could impair free speech. No one sensitive to the American and to the Maryland tradition of free speech and of free assembly can deny that *H. B. 291* offends against both. Doubtful in constitutionality if passed, *H. B. 291* is so doubtful on the wider and more obvious ground of public policy that it ought not to be considered."

Hoover's Mercy Plan— And the Bishops

EX-PRESIDENT Herbert Hoover devised a plan to feed the hungry, starving multitudes of Europe.

It was a plan not agreeable to the British Government.

Consequently, it was a plan not agreeable to its New Deal partners.

Mr. Hoover explored the Catholic hierarchy to discover those who would support the Hoover plan.

Heading the list of 20 Catholic prelates who agreed publicly to support it and thereby help swing American public opinion to the Hoover mercy plan at the risk of affronting Great Britain and its New Deal subservients, were William Cardinal O'Connell, Archbishop of Boston, the Most Rev. John A. Floersch of Louisville, Kentucky, and the Most Rev. John T. McNicholas of Cincinnati.

These prelates signed a document which reads, in part, as follows:

"As individual American citizens — in co-operation with religious leaders of every denomination, who have publicly expressed their support and approval of Herbert Hoover's plan to relieve starvation within the occupied countries of Europe — we join in giving expression to our strong belief that the exigencies of even a just war do not require that millions of innocent children, women and noncombatants be made to endure famine.

"A victory built on the dead bodies of starving women and children, innocent victims of the war over which they have no control, will destroy human sentiments that must necessarily enter into any form of enduring peace.

"The proposals of the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies, of which former President Herbert Hoover is honorary chairman, are humanitarian and should be carried out in the name of Christian charity. Conditions set up by this committee specifically provide that none of the food, directly or indirectly, shall reach or benefit Germany. As long as this condition is maintained we cannot see why such a humanitarian and Christian proposal should be rejected.

"We hope and pray that those who guide the destinies of nations will be conscious of their obligation to protect the innocent, and not lay obstacles in the path of a movement whose sole object is to alleviate dire distress without affording aid to those who have invaded the lands of these many millions of starving and helpless fellow humans.

"With the Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, we believe that 'we can desire nothing more in such a convulsion of things than to help the bodies and raise the spirits' of the innocent victims of war."

Mr. Hoover received letters from other members of the hierarchy either favoring or disfavoring his plan. One member of the hierarchy was reluctant to have his name published lest its publication might be construed as embarrassing to the Government.

Concentration of Wealth

Monopoly Committee Hits Money Powers

THE startling data and conclusions of the Temporary National Economic Committee, reported recently after a comprehensive study of nearly three years, confirms to a great extent the facts and opinions reiterated by Father Coughlin for the last 10 years.

Substantially the Committee, composed of six Congressmen and 11 members of the Executive branch of the Government, declared that the tremendous concentration of economic power in the hands of a few constitutes a grave danger to American democracy, economy and liberty.

The Committee's findings bring pointedly to mind the words of *Quadragesimo Anno,* the great Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius XI on the Reconstruction of the Social Order.

In his writings and radio discourses Father Coughlin has quoted extensively from that masterpiece to impress upon the American public the evils of the present economic system as outlined clearly by the late Holy Father.

* * *

Among the principal disclosures of the T.N.E.C. (Monopoly Committee), as reported by the *Christian Science Monitor* are:

(1) Concentration of economic power and monopoly which prolonged the 1929 depression throughout the 30's and in some instances still exercises a crippling effect on efforts to achieve full recovery.

(2) For one-half of the 1,807 manufactured products taken by the Department of Commerce for cross-section examination, the results showed that the four leading manufacturers accounted for 75 per cent or more of the total United States output.

(3) Many of the country's most important resources, including iron ore, oil, copper and others are under the control of an iron-clad monopoly.

(4) Control of investment funds is concentrated in a relatively few hands. In 1935-36, for example, income received by almost a third of American families was less than $750; nearly 70 per cent received less than $1500 a year, while only 2 per cent had incomes above $5000. Only 1 per cent had incomes over $10,000.

(5) In the life-insurance business, controlling 28-billion in assets, five of the 308 legal reserve companies control nearly 55 per cent of the assets.

(6) In 1929, 80 per cent of all corporation incomes was received by 0.3 per cent of the corporations.

(7) Over half of the corporate dividends paid out in recent years has gone to about 2 per cent of the total number of families.

(8) In 1937, the 20 largest shareholders in the 200 largest corporations of the country studied, averaged a third of the voting stock. Forty per cent of the corporations had a control vested in one family or in a small group of families. Fifteen of the 200 were controlled by three families: The du Ponts, the Rockefellers, and the Mellons while their holdings in these corporations were valued at $1-billion, 400-million.

(9) Land ownership has become increasingly concentrated as a result of farm mechanization, the depression and the draught.

(10) Home ownership shows a similar picture.

(11) The control of the resources of the country rests in relatively few hands, it is stated, illustrated by the piling up of more than $15-billions in assets by the five largest insurance companies.

(12) In almost no case, "does the stockholder or policyholder have a voice in the management of his company, which is carried on almost entirely by a small, self-perpetuating group of managing directors."

(13) Concentrations of savings is also charged. "Individual savings are likewise the property of a very small group at the top of the pyramid." Charts are offered to show that the top 10 per cent of the population saved 86 per cent of total savings while the lower 80 per cent had only 2 per cent of the savings, as of 1936.

* * *

Paradoxical though it may appear, this tremendous concentration of economic power, under the transformations of America's planned economy, borders on a strange admixture of Communism, Socialism and Fascism.

"We cannot continue to rely upon Government expenditures, whether by way of contribution or loan, to sustain enterprise and private employment unless we are willing to invite eventually some form of the authoritarian state," the Committee declares.

It finds "germs" of both Fascism and Socialism already "apparent in our own economy" and cites the Bituminous Coal Act as having set up "an order which is not without its resemblance to the Fascist order."

Instead of Government spending, the Committee proposes encouragement of private enterprise and use of private capital.

It studiously avoids suggesting that the Government take over the national economy in order to curb private monopolies. Contrarily, it says that the Government must keep private enterprise free, both of Government and private monopoly.

In other words, business must be protected from itself and for itself — free of Governmental attempts at collectivization. Otherwise, both free Government and free enterprise, the foundations of what we call democracy are undermined.

At the present, and for past several years, monopoly has been choking the nation's economic system, the Committee declares. It asserts there must be "permanent decentralization of the economic controls created and exploited by financial, industrial, insurance and commodity monopolists."

* * *

Among the Committee's concrete recommendations are: more effective anti-trust action, the prevention of inter-locking directorates, submission of all mergers over $5-million to the Federal Trade Commission, compulsion of national corporations to secure national charters in states. To prevent the maintenance of monopoly by suppression of patents, the Committee suggests that all patents be made available upon payment of just and reasonable royalties.

Finally, the T.N.E.C. points out that the Administration has an immediate and dramatic opportunity to eliminate monopolies by enacting legislation hitting economic and financial controls.

Defense contracts offer this opportunity to shape and reform the national economy. The Committee sharply criticizes the "amazing concentration" of the $13-billion of national defense contracts already allocated. It charges justly that the National Defense Council exercises monopolistic powers over American industry greater than those exercised by Hitler over the Reich's collectivized industry.

"To marshall the resources of America in defense of democracy," declares the report, "there has been set up in Washington in the Office of Emergency Management and under the Council of National Defense an instrumentality of economic concentration the like of which the world has never seen. Not even Hitler commands industrial power and resources comparable to those directed by one central authority in the massive effort of America to protect the free peoples of the world against totalitarian aggression.

Asserting that "the burden of national defense must be shared equally by all our people and that all must have an opportunity to participate in the effort," the Committee lashes out at the geographical and economic concentration of defense contracts.

It finds that 81.44 per cent of the $13,343,000,000 thus far allocated in defense contracts has been confined to 15 states and that 45 per cent of the business was awarded to six closely inter-related corporate groups.

Idaho, Montana and North Dakota had not received a single defense contract at the end of February, 1941.

In passing out Government contracts officials apparently have forgotten that there is "little steel" in America as well as "big steel"; that there are small independent shipbuilders as well as giant concerns interlocked with "big steel"; that there are airplane manufacturers not under the domination and control of the Lehman banking *clique;* that there are small producers and manufacturers not in gigantic food, commodity, canning and processing groups; that there are producers of munitions, powder and petroleum not controlled by the gigantic munitions and petroleum trusts.

The Administration had an opportunity to aid "little business," but let that opportunity slip in helping the monopolists perpetuate their economic power and continue to exploit the financial controls they created.

Foreign control of patents used by American industry has hindered the national defense program, the Committee reveals, singling out the aluminum industry as an outstanding example.

In its analysis of the insurance field, the Committee opposes the rigid government

(Continued on Page 15)

Reds Still in the Picture, But—

Mexico Veers Toward New Deal Socialism

THE recent return of "bloody" General Canabal to Mexico from his exile in Cuba indicates that the Comacho Government has not broken away, completely, from Communism. Despite Comacho's campaign promises that his administration would eliminate Communism and Communists in Mexico, it is evident that he is recalling many Communists who were exiled by Cardenas upon his accession to power.

Many of these Communists, headed by such notorious sadists as Canabal, were bigwigs in the Calles regime. It is now known that the Spanish Communists and Loyalists — exiles in Mexico — have high pressured Comacho to grant a general amnesty to these Reds exiled by Cardenas. In fact, the Loyalists have bribed Mexican officials to permit Mexico's notorious radicals to return to their native land — bribes made from funds stolen by the Loyalists from Spain.

Evidently the Spanish Loyalists and Communists have designs on Mexico. Recently, thousands of Spanish Loyalists and international Communists exiled from France arrived in Mexico as political refugees and exiles. Also the former Minister of War in Loyalist Spain, Indalecio Prieto, succeeded in getting millions of dollars by his sale in America of Spanish jewels, precious stones and bar gold and his sale to Canada of airplane motors and propellers.

Thousands of Loyalist-Communist soldiers recruited from all nations of the world and recently released in a general amnesty by Generalissimo Franco, have landed in Mexico where they have not been demobilized.

The announcement made by General Avila Comacho that he was a good "Believer" and hence he was unalterably opposed to Communism was publicized in America to indicate that America, in supporting Comacho against Almazan, was endeavoring to set up in Mexico a democratic form of government untainted by Communism. Comacho was not long in office when he began to adopt some of the policies of Calles, who also has been invited to return to his native land.

* * *

The recent announcement of Mexico's Minister of the Interior that Mexico welcomed foreign capital to participate in the development of new oil fields in his nation may mean a retreat from the outright Communist expropriation and confiscation program of Cardenas and Calles; but it also means a return to Mexico's petroleum laws enacted some years ago. The present proposal of Senor Aleman certainly indicates that Mexico does not intend to return to the days when foreign capitalists were allowed to operate in Mexico without restriction and limitation. Foreign capital will be required to work through purely Mexican companies, thus foreign capitalists will not operate, manage and control their investment and capital. The invitation does not apply to mining operations in existing properties which have been confiscated and socialized by the government, for the status of these properties has yet to be determined in American and British negotiations with Mexico.

Nevertheless, the proposal represents a decided change and departure from Mexico's former outright Communist policies.

Mexico is undergoing a peaceful revolution and bloodless transformation. While the Calles and Cardenas Governments had unmistakable Communist leanings, the Comacho Government has adopted semi-socialistic policies modeled after America's semi-socialistic New Deal. Extreme leftists of the Communist type have been superseded by leftists of the New Deal school.

There are many reasons to explain this change of program in Mexico. Moderate leftists saw the folly of pursuing extreme socialism or Communism in a nation which was Catholic and Occidental. They learned from years of experience in the Calles-Cardenas regime that the Mexican people would not surrender their traditional religious training and rights even though Mexico be bathed in blood, and that Mexicans did not take kindly to Communist measures such as socialist education, government expropriation of private property, confiscation of produce and wealth, regimentation of labor and the ruthless suppression of all opposition.

The leftists learned that the government and workers could not operate profitably and efficiently the railroads, communications, petroleum and mining properties the government had seized. Mexico needed foreign capital to operate its existent productive enterprises and to develop its resources; but the Mexicans learned that the Communist policies of their government had antagonized private and foreign capital. The war curtailed Mexico's petroleum, ore, and commodity markets and this added pressure on Mexico's economy aggravated the difficulties created by radical policies and programs. Mexico was forced to pay from the government treasury the wages of workers in the industries that had been socialized and that had lost the market for their products. The leftists realized that the government paid a high price for the experiment of seizing and unprofitably operating wells, mines and plantations for inefficient workers. But, when the government had to underwrite not only the losses in production, but even the salaries of inefficient workers, the government decided to abandon Communism and to embrace New Dealism.

Finally, Mexican leaders have recognized the possibilities of a Nazi victory in Europe and of Nazi penetration into Central and South America. Hence, they have drawn near to America in hemispheric solidarity and defense. Mexican leaders have even expressed a willingness to enter a mutual defense pact with the United States whereby the two nations would pool their war resources and both nations would grant to each other the right to use sea and air bases for mutual defense.

America has expressed her willingness to underwrite Mexico's rearmament and preparation for national defense through continued purchases of Mexican silver and through favored nations' trade treaties and loans from government agencies established to promote hemispheric defense.

Henry Wallace was sent to Mexico for the specific purpose of discussing close collaboration between the Roosevelt and Comacho Administrations on the basis of the aid granted by Roosevelt to Comacho during the latter's campaign for his election. Even now, experts from the United States State Department have been detailed to aid Mexico in adopting a new national economy and a new international program along the lines of United States policies.

However, it is remarkable that the Roosevelt Administration, with such power over Comacho as to force the Mexican statesmen to abandon their Communist program in favor of a New Deal plan, would permit the return to Mexico of such well known radicals as Canabal.

(Continued from Page 14)

control suggested by some New Dealers as a remedy for the insurance monopoly.

* * *

Americans are seeing their national economy undergoing a radical change induced by the exigencies of war against rigidly controlled economies of the totalitarian powers. The present American choice seems to be between monopoly exercised by private capitalists and producers and monopoly exercised by the bureaucratic Government. The latter course seems to be the New Deal selection.

America is following the pattern of the totalitarian nations by establishing the Government as a super-corporation regulating and controlling monopolies, which in turn have destroyed smaller competitors. Monopolies, publicly owned by citizen stockholders but operated by monopolistic directors, still exist in Russia, Germany, Italy, France and Great Britain; but they are controlled by the State.

Any halting of this trend toward state socialism or any attempt to break the private economic stranglehold of the few must begin with a reform of the credit monopoly as exercised by the privately owned Federal Reserve System.

Industrial and business monopoly, so vigorously attacked by the T.N.E.C., is made possible largely through credit monopoly under which big business is favored with credit for expansion while small business or new business is discriminated against. Likewise, those who control credit all too frequently control industries, insurance companies and other enterprises in which they have a heavy financial interest.

SOCIAL JUSTICE believes the T.N.E.C.'s findings, though enlightening to many and corroborative of our charges in the past, will be productive of no real remedial action unless the root of the problem — the financial monopoly of the Federal Reserve Banks is eliminated.

Pope Pius' Warning Ten Years Ago

TEN years ago — long before the T.N.E.C. was conceived — Pope Pius XI, in *Quadragesimo Anno*, deplored the evils of concentration of economic power and declared such concentration eventually leads to conflicts between nations, fomented by financial imperialists holding that "where a man's fortune is, there is his country."

(Continued on Page 18)

Letters

(SOCIAL JUSTICE aims to make this page a free forum and readers' opinions are invited. Naturally the views expressed are not always those of this magazine. We cannot guarantee that contributions sent to SOCIAL JUSTICE can be returned to the writers. Letters not signed with the writer's name and address cannot be considered, although the name will not necessarily be used. We reserve the right to publish all letters received unless contrary instruction is specifically given.)

Suggests Congressional Probe of Hollywood Picture Business

TO THE EDITOR:

Judging from the tone of the character witnesses, testifying as to the "lily-white" character of the Russian-born Tia Juana, Mexico gambler, Joe Schenck, on trial in New York Federal Court on 24 counts of fraud, income tax evasion, and making false statements to a government Federal Bureau of Investigation operator, the citizens of this once fair land of the free and the home of the brave were nearly treated to another "white-wash," similar to the "Communist Harry Bridges-Madame Perkins-Landis" disgrace in San Francisco.

The same International Bankers group, wreckers of France under the leadership of Leon Blum, are trying to prove to the citizens of the United States that their kind can do no harm or commit no sin, and if they are caught in the act like Joe Schenck and the big-name supporters of Communism, in Hollywood, it was all in fun, and the boys should be not only forgiven but elevated to key positions with the government or placed on the boards of directors of National Charity organizations like the President's Infantile Birthday Parties.

The trial of Schenck and Moscowitz is a splendid example of this, in my opinion.

The Hollywood motion picture industry needs a house-cleaning, a purging of all men of Schenck's caliber. Under the present Hollywood leadership Hollywood is sick. Its affliction could be very easily overcome were it not for the fact that, using nepotism to cement the entire industry more and more firmly into one miasmic mass, allegedly incompetent relatives have been given lucrative key jobs.

After years of gangster pictures educating the youth of America with false values and making the peoples of foreign nations in which the pictures have been shown believe that ours is a nation of morons addicted to rowdyism; after years of sexy pictures of perversion of all the finer principles of decent, home loving Americans; after years of pictures filled with atheistic philosophies of foreigners and now with the "hate-filled," inspired propaganda of the new alien refugee writers, directors, actors and actresses, permeating hundreds of thousands of feet of film, and thus forcing dangerous, disturbing and destructive doctrines into the heartbeats of American and American life, we can expect most anything to occur, from the complete desecration of all that is Divine to the actual waging of war.

In order that the truth concerning Schenck and Hollywood be known, in order that an influence of evil may be removed from America, it is within the rights of the American people to demand a Congressional investigation to be made of the Hollywood Motion Picture Industry.

If Congress forms an investigating committee and appoints a fearless, capable and honest legal advisor and investigator like Congressman Martin Dies, to examine the conduct of all leaders of the Motion Picture Industry, the public will soon be relieved of an illness which has spread over the entire United States.

—B.W.

Miami Beach, Fla.

Counting a Billion

TO THE EDITOR:

"How much is a billion dollars? Let us take a boy of 15 years, suggesting that he count a billion $1 bills, working eight hours a day, five days a week. If he hustles, he can count 100 bills a minute. That is $6-thousand an hour, or $48-thousand a day, or $240-thousand a week.

At the end of the year, with five holidays off and no vacation, our lad has counted $14,240,000. When he is 21 years old, he has counted $74,550,000.

Still there is a big pile of dollar bills in front of him. On his fifty-fifth birthday, he is just half way through the pile, still counting at the clip of 100 bills a minute.

But when he has counted a billion, he is ninety-six years old. He has beaten the insurance tables and has stooped shoulders; but he has counted his billion.

It's easier to spend someone else's billion than it is to count your own. If you don't believe it, try it."

This is the point made by Congressman Rich, of Pennsylvania, in the House of Representatives on March 9, 1941, in opposing the gift of $7-billion to the British Empire.

Will this money, as in the past, be used to continue starving the people after the war is over and to accumulate the wealth of the world in the hands of those who control the Empire?

Southbridge, Mass. —N.R.

What Is Russia?

TO THE EDITOR:

For the benefit of those who never had read about it, following is a copy of the telegram sent by President Roosevelt to Soviet Russia some time ago: "His Excellency Mikhail Kalinin. Upon this national anniversary please accept my felicitations and sincere good wishes for the well being of the people of your country. Franklin D. Roosevelt."

Ever since Mr. Roosevelt sent his congratulatory message to Kalinin on the anniversary of the Russian communist revolution, and without here reviewing the horrible atrocities perpetrated for the past twenty years or more against the Christians, we are told that one day Russia is a Christian nation, another day she is an atheist nation, another day she is a democracy, another day she is a dictatorship, another day she is Communist, another day she is an aggressor and another day she is a moral state.

These statements are made by various groups for various purposes and interests. Will someone in Washington please tell me definitely and officially what Russia really is? No sooner than I make up my mind of what Russia is, bang—another statement is made that Russia is something else.

As if this were not enough, we are now told that China is a democracy. That Greece is a democracy. By the way, when did Chiang Kai Shek get elected? Are Yugoslavia and Turkey democracies? Well, it all depends to what direction the wind blows.

If only this "free" American press would really become free and tell us some truth!

In printing this letter please use my initials, as it looks that we decent pro-American Christians are going to be taken "into custody" or be placed in some little camp to concentrate for having the courage to speak up.

—J.P.

Milwaukee, Wis.

We're 'Pro-British'!

TO THE EDITOR:

I have been reading SOCIAL JUSTICE of March 31, 1941, and I am amazed at what appears on page 9 regarding the treatment that the Poles are receiving at the hands of the Germans. I am principally amazed to think that SOCIAL JUSTICE would publish anything which is so palpably propaganda against Germany.

Your correspondent must have lain awake nights thinking up his tale of horrors. Anyone who has known the German people knows that they are neither barbarous nor vicious, and as far as Hitler goes, he has indeed proven a wonderful leader and strategist for his compatriots who voted him into power. He is the only leader in the world today who had the courage to lash the money-changers from the temple, who promptly took the next boat to America where they play chief advisers to the government at Washington.

Father Coughlin never pussyfooted, and I am sure he would repudiate all the propaganda displayed on page 9 in the March 31 issue in relation to the Poles. I have subscribed to SOCIAL JUSTICE since its first publication, but I must say that there is nothing of justice in the "reports that are relayed to our correspondent," etc., etc. Your "correspondent" should confine his efforts to writing penny-dreadfuls.

—A.M.B.

Winthrop, Mass.

She's Old Fashioned Now

—Parrish in the Chicago Tribune.

Letters

'Charley McCarthys'

TO THE EDITOR:

There is nothing that gripes me more than to tune in on one of the popular radio forums and hear some "Charlie McCarthy" prate about saving democracy, all-out aid to Britain, or any other of the thousand and one superficialities that end with our being just where we were in the beginning.

Some of these men are dupes, others misinformed, others uninformed and some even sincere. But the fact remains that all of these forums are as good as nothing insofar as enlightening the people goes. In a certain sense, they are little more than the entertainment they supply.

Today, we in America, together with the peoples of the world, are victims of as vicious an hypocrisy as has ever been perpetrated in the annals of history. In the words of Christ, only the truth can make us free, and may SOCIAL JUSTICE, until such time as it may conceivably be beaten into submission, continue to raise its voice to all intelligent enough to understand and willing to listen!

—R.F.S.

Philadelphia, Pa.

Knocks Knox

TO THE EDITOR:

By way of casting a little light on the altogether queer and untenable position of Mr. Frank Knox as we see him today—in such striking contrast with his loud, nation-wide squawkings throughout the 1936 campaign may we be permitted to inquire: Who owns the *Chicago Daily News* today?

Was the story reporting the "taking over" of the *News* by Kuhn, Loeb & Co., of Wall Street, published in black-faced type on page one in the *New York Enquirer* . . . currently at the time Knox "turned his coat" and took over the Navy at the command of somebody or other . . . was this story true or false? Under such circumstances were international unscrupulous bankers putting high pressure heat on Knox, or was it some other kind of heat?

The writer believes that no honest, patriotic man can serve two masters at the same time, faithfully! If it be true that Mr. Knox was forced into compromising his avowed principles as it appears he has done, the facts regarding the alleged entry into conduct of his affairs may conceivably explain much that has baffled his friends. The people should be immediately informed about recently acquired new ownerships of important newspapers throughout the country. This is vital to an intelligent, informed American public opinion.

—A.C.M.

Albany, N. Y.

A Worker's Argument

TO THE EDITOR:

Although I have been a regular reader of SOCIAL JUSTICE for some years and have taken most of its articles as good teaching, I beg to differ with the article on U.S.A. vs. C.I.O. in the April 7 issue.

When entering a union, one is never asked what his political beliefs are. This would be un-American to do so. Communist-minded men are in the unions and even in the government, but what has been done about it?

We workers at Allis Chalmers are not striking for a closed shop as the newspapers would have you believe, but we do want some sort of "union security."

There have been a few persons who have been conducting anti-union activities, and have been rewarded by the company instead of being reprimanded.

This strike and a lot of others could be expected as long as working men watch the company profits mount, without corresponding increases in wages.

We have seen how this was carried on in the last war crises. We do not want it to happen again, for where will we be when this is all over?

The company does not want to give in, even partially to our demands. It wants outright surrender, and then the anti-union fight can be resumed. Why have such a thing as bargaining rights, if no bargaining can be done?

The government, as your article states, commanded us to return to work. Who and what part of the government commanded this?

Well, it was Navy Secretary Frank Knox, head of a Chicago newspaper, and William S. Knudsen, a head of General Motors, neither one have been elected by the people, but have been appointed to their posts.

Could it be expected to have these men on the side of common labor? Besides this, just what has happened to Sidney Hillman, the other O.P.M. Director and the O.P.M. agreement that the company balked at?

I would also like to know just what is meant by holding up "national defense." Is that defense when we are not at war, but are giving a greater portion of our production to some foreign country? No! That is better classed as "offense."

As far as the strike vote is concerned, who was it that ordered this check-up? The person who did it is a strike-breaking attorney, who for years has kept men in different factories out on strikes.

Furthermore, what does it mean to be classed as a Communist? I think maybe it is all right, for isn't Russia classed as a friendly nation?

I appreciate your concern over the impurities of unions and would gladly accept any advice in cleansing them.

—W.J.B.

Milwaukee, Wis.

Issue Before the World Is Materialism vs. Christianity

TO THE EDITOR:

There is no person in this world who knows what the wave of the future holds in store for us, but we may be sure that if the nations of Europe and the political parasites in the United States continue to take the road of materialism, the future will not be pleasant.

We have individuals in our midst who, even though they hate Hitler's aggressions, seem to like his materialistic philosophy. They would, if they got the chance—and I believe if we continue to encourage them they will—set up a socialistic form of government where individual citizens would be nothing but slaves who would move only when they were commanded.

We have individuals in our nation, who call Adolf Hitler all sorts of names, many he no doubt deserves, but at the same time picture Josef Stalin of Soviet Russia, and his pagan philosophy as some democratic social reform. These same pied pipers of hate are telling us England is fighting for freedom and Christianity while they themselves supported openly the murderers who dominated Spain before the poor country was liberated by General Franco. Since the Stalin-Hitler pact many of the liberals have become jittery when speaking of Stalin. They find plenty of reasons to criticize him but still can not brush from their minds the hope that he is the leader of a new utopia.

Soviet Russia has marched into Finland, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia and has taken over half of Poland. Her campaign to bring Spain under her domination was the most bloody and horrible event in history.

The world today is being constantly endangered by the evils of godless individuals. Every nation in Europe is facing a rapid deterioration because they have taken the path leading away from the principles of Christianity.

—R.J.G.

Nutley, N. J.

Free Verse

TO THE EDITOR:

I quote:

"When the Devil is sick
A monk—he would like to be."
When Great Britain is sick—
Then—she likes democracy.
The question is: are we gobbled up
'Again'—a British Colony?—
In all our history—
Great Britain was—
Our No. 1 enemy.
Please, do not sell us short!
Improve our own country
For the plain majority:
Unemployment and short selling
Is a curse and danger
To our blessed liberty.

—Dr. A.K.

Melrose, Minn.

On Back-Stabbing

TO THE EDITOR:

I am 100% for the United States. My husband was a soldier in the World War. Yet I cannot but respect the land of my birth. I am proud of the Italian race, and its contributions to humanity.

The newspapers and commentators ignored the incident when the British slew one thousand French sailors in cold blood at Oran. Not long ago we were told that Italy "stabbed France in the back." But if we remember the Versailles Treaty, we know that it was the French and British who stabbed Italy in the back.

Therefore, in all fairness, we cry out in horror at this propaganda. If we must have propaganda let both sides express their share. Or better yet, let's have none at all!

Cleveland, Ohio. —Mrs. F.G.

Propaganda Prophecy

TO THE EDITOR:

The method of the Dr. Gallup poll of public opinion may be mysterious, but the technique is quite obvious and simple. I would like to prove this technique by recording it in your column, if you please.

We will use the "report" of the Gallup poll of April 6, 1941, as our model, as it appears in the *Cincinnati Enquirer* under the caption "Public Still Opposed Declaration of War, Expeditionary Force—Proportion Approximately Four To One." So the issue is "Declaration of War."

Four to One today, April 6 . . . ! In two to three weeks the ratio will be given out as 60% opposed to the Declaration of War, with 40% favoring it. In other words, it will be cut down from 4 to 1 to 6 to 4.

In another two to three weeks the ratio will be cut down to 52% favoring the Declaration with only 48% against.

Of course, during all this time Dr. Gallup will do nothing more than read Senator Pepper's speeches—nor will his "investigators" do anything more than warm their swivel chairs. So "public opinion" will be made by Dr. Gallup.

Cincinnati, Ohio. —J.P.H.

Father Coughlin Crucified

TO THE EDITOR:

Christians often wonder why the Jews crucified our Savior, but do these same Christians wonder why Rev. Father Coughlin was also crucified?

Father Coughlin, whose radio sermons were comforting and enlightening; Father Coughlin, whose every prediction has come to pass; Father Coughlin, who practiced as well as preached social justice, and denounced social injustice; Father Coughlin, who dared to call a spade a spade.

Christ was crucified by the Jews because He denounced injustice; and Father Coughlin was barred from radio broadcasting because he denounced injustice.

St. Paul, Minn. —Mrs. M.J.

Comment

(Continued from Page 15)

In the belief that the present domestic situation as well as the war abroad is the result of conditions portrayed by Pius, SOCIAL JUSTICE reprints pertinent passages from that Encyclical:

"This power becomes particularly irresistible when exercised by those who, because they hold and control money, are able also to govern credit and determine its allotment, for that reason supplying so to speak, the life-blood of the entire economic body, and grasping, as it were, in their hands the very soul of production, so that no one dares to breathe against their will.

"This accumulation of power, the characteristic note of the modern economic order, is a natural result of limitless free competition which permits the survival of those only who are the strongest, which often means those who fight most relentlessly, who pay least heed to the dictates of conscience.

"This concentration of power has led to a threefold struggle for domination. First, there is the struggle for dictatorship in the economic sphere itself; then, the fierce battle to acquire control of the state, so that its resources and authority may be abused in the economic struggles. Finally the clash between the states themselves.

"This latter arises from two causes: Because the nations apply their power and political influence, regardless of circumstances, to promote the economic advantages of their citizens; and because, vice versa, economic forces and economic domination are used to decide political controversies between peoples.

"You assuredly know, Venerable Brethren and Beloved Children, and you lament the ultimate consequences of this Individualistic spirit in economic affairs. Free competition is dead: economic dictatorship has taken its place.

"Unbridled ambition for domination has succeeded the desire for gain; the whole economic life has become hard, cruel and relentless in a ghastly measure. Furthermore, the intermingling and scandalous confusing of the duties and offices of civil authority and of economics has produced crying evils and have gone so far as to degrade the majesty of the state. The state, which should be the supreme arbiter, ruling in kingly fashion far above all party contention, intent only upon justice and the common good, has become instead a slave, bound over to the service of human passion and greed. As regards the relations of peoples among themselves, a double stream has issued forth from this one fountainhead on the one hand, economic nationalism or even economic imperialism; on the other, a not less noxious and detestable internationalism or international imperialism in financial affairs, which holds that where a man's fortune is, there is his country."

New York Times Called Paganistic

THE *Catholic Review* is the official organ of the Archdiocese of Baltimore and Washington.

In its issue of April 11th it printed the following editorial:

"The editorial, 'Tragedy in Hungary,' published in the *New York Times* last Friday, was a shocking and paganistic one.

"It dealt with the suicide of Count Paul Telecki, Premier of Hungary, who shot himself in protest against the usurpation of Hungary by the Nazis.

" 'For a man of Telecki's temperament and character,' says the *Times* editorial, 'suicide was a deliberate act, and an act of state, the only gesture he could make of protest and refusal.'

"That is a damnable, un-Christian, God-defying statement for any newspaper to publish. It is an approval of self-murder. It makes of one of the most terrible of all sins something that is glorious, patriotic and statesmanlike.

"Man is not the author of his life. His life does not belong to him, but to his Creator. Suicide means that a man puts himself above God, Who is the author of life.

"To say that there was nothing else a man of Telecki's temperament and character could have done is false, damnably false. He could have lived to fight for the rights of his people against overwhelming odds. That would have required courage — the courage that makes a man a hero — not self-destruction that makes a man an enemy of God and a moral coward.

"None of us can sit in judgment on Count Telecki, though the *Times* essays to do so by calling Count Telecki's act a deliberate one. It may be that Count Telecki lost his reason through worry, through grief over the misfortunes of his country. If his mind were all jangled out of tune when he committed suicide, God will forgive him. We have to leave Count Telecki's fate to the Supreme Judge and not to the decision of an editorial writer on the *New York Times*.

"The editorial on Count Telecki in the *Times* is in keeping with the letter written by one of the officials of that paper to the Rev. Walter H. Ahern of Saint Brigid's parish, Baltimore. The letter was in reply to a protest made by Father Ahern against the publication in the *Times* of an advertisement paid for by a group of Birth Controllers."

SOCIAL JUSTICE commends the forthrighteousness and courage of the *Catholic Review* and its editors in bringing to the attention of the American public the paganistic philosophy which dominates the editorial pages of the *New York Times* — one of the chief journalistic vehicles in America interested in propagandizing this nation into a blood bath.

History Repeating Itself

THE San Francisco *Monitor*, commenting on the passion of Christ, as written down in the four gospels, said (April 5):

As it (the passion) is read we will visualize Christ, standing in judgment before the "world." That "world" is always the same, and we may know even as we stand, that the more we are like Christ the more like His will be our judgment from that same world.

The "world" in the Passion story is represented by

(1) *Pilate*, the personal agent of absolute political and military power, worldly wise, cynical and coldly scientific;

(2) *Herod*, the blood of the Machabbees, corrupted by riches and seduced by avoidance of responsibility, spending in play-boy fashion the betrayed earnings of his people;

(3) *Annas and Caiphas*, the high priests of God, more interested in the financial returns from a temple used for thieves' purposes and in the bureaucracy that hardened the law of the prophets than in the essential religious truths that Christ taught and exemplified, hating Him for His reproach and refusing to accept the evidence;

(4) *The Pharisees and Sadduccees*, envious of the Roman force, yet doing politics with it;

(5) *The Rabble*, roused by the propagandists;

(6) *Barabbas*, the great thief, preferred to the Innocent Man;

(7) *The Crucified Thieves*, small men caught in the act;

(8) *The Soldiers of Rome and the Servants*, sadists enjoying cruelty.

That is the "world" before which Christ was judged. They hated the Man without Sin, for His innocence was their own reproach.

The "world" does not change from generation to generation. The same elements are with us today.

We may ask ourselves as we stand and listen, to what section of the "world" do we belong? If we would "screw up our courage" to leave it and stand with Christ, we must be ready to be crucified. And for that courage we must believe in the Resurrection of the body.

Christians and War

THE following paragraphs appeared in the *Milwaukee Journal* (March 21st) under the title, "Tells Christian Duties in War":

"Are there times when war is justified, when Christians are actually duty bound to support it?

"Father John L. Callahan of the Dominican House of Studies at River Forest, Ill., answered in the affirmative Thursday night in a lecture on 'The Thomistic Concept of War' at Messmer high school and cited the teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas to support his own viewpoint.

"The philosophy of St. Thomas, Father Callahan said, held that if war is called by a lawful authority for a just cause, the citizen has a moral obligation to respond. Today, he added, that philosophy would obligate Catholic youth to support the American selective service program and all defense plans of President Roosevelt and Congress."

Our comment is that it would be more profitable to tell Christians their duties in peace.

And our further comment would be to insist upon an answer to the question whether this war is just or unjust.

From the record of past wars we know that they were bought with Judas Iscariot money to betray the brothers and sisters of Jesus Christ for the profiteering of the Annases and Caiphases.

We have every reason to believe that this war is no different.

Why not investigate before we find ourselves pulpiteering the boys from our parishes into a blood bath?

Comment

Most Reverend Gerald Shaughnessy

MOST Rev. Gerald Shaughnessy is the Roman Catholic Bishop of Seattle.

Last week (April 13) he proved to the American public that he did not bear an Irish name in vain; and he also proved to the American public that he did not wear a bishop's miter in vain.

Said he in his Easter sermon at St. James Cathedral, Seattle:

"Recently we witnessed an exciting national campaign and election in which specific statements were made and most solemn pledges given to our country, supposedly on the word of honor of a Christian gentleman.

"But a few days ago, when this person, whose later action belied his promises, was taxed with his own words, he lightly dismissed the subject with the revealing words: 'That was but campaign oratory.'

"Lying is thus enthroned before us as a public god and a means to which apparently our leaders, or would-be leaders, may resort with impunity."

In his Easter Sunday sermon, the Bishop also said a serious threat to the nation had been made in the recommendation put forth by "one of the assistant attorney generals, in charge of anti-trust prosecutions.

"By a strange quirk of fate and a most peculiar mentality," the Bishop added, "he has publicly advocated that, in what is termed the present emergency, all the churches of the United States be, in effect, suppressed and in their place there be set up some invention of the government that might perhaps be termed a state church."

At another point in his sermon, Bishop Shaughnessy assailed what he termed possible conscription of labor, capital and women. "Such moves," he said, "are the very evils that we decry throughout the world and which we ourselves would not madly embrace as the cure for home conditions."

Of course, Monsignor Ryan might classify the good Bishop as a "faker." Real patriots will classify him as another John Fisher.

'Hadar,' Jewish Journal Gives Sound Advice

IN THE February, 1940, issue of *Hadar*—Jewish-American youth magazine, Josiah C. Wedgwood writes as follows.

"There are times when men should break laws. Such times come rarely when people make their own laws, as in countries with a representative Legislature. The tendency in England is to obey a law even if it seems unjust, for it has been all argued out in public and justice has been weighed and measured against expediency. It is when conscience and the law conflict when we are forced to decide between the law of God and the law of men, that resistance breaks out. And those who then have dared to break the law of man have come to be called in after years patriots and martyrs.

"Any such action required both comradeship and self-sacrifice. A strong religious or national inspiration is generally necessary to secure concerted breaking of the law. All the stepping-stones to liberty in English history have been made by men acting in concert under such inspiration. We owe all to our forerunners who broke the laws."

* * *

Indeed it is better to serve God than man.

Holy Scripture praises such philosophy as enunciated by the mother of the Maccabees.

History praises such philosophy as practiced by Washington and his compatriots.

And it would only be a stick-in-the-mud retrogressive with a conscience caked over with British "kindness" who would condemn the Irish patriots for having rebelled against the British aggressors.

Possibly the time has come in this nation when we should consider seriously the thoughts expressed in the quotation imprinted above.

When conscience and the law conflict, when we are forced to decide between the law of God and the law of men, there is no virtue in being a compromisor; there is no courage in being a silent coward; there is no honesty in the diplomacy of fear.

* * *

Prior to 1776, there were mealy-mouthed conservatives in America who regarded Washington and his compatriots as crackpots and traitors.

Yes, they were looked upon as sinful men who dared assail the majesty of King George III's New Deal.

Nevertheless, they were not tories; they were not craven cowards, afraid of criticism or even death itself.

Would that the spirit of Washington and these compatriots return to us!

Notice!

WHAT do you think, readers, of the contents of this issue of SOCIAL JUSTICE?

What did you think of the contents of the previous issues?

SOCIAL JUSTICE is barred from army camps.

SOCIAL JUSTICE practically is barred from the newsstands of America.

More than all that, we are told that word has gone out to certain editors not to quote SOCIAL JUSTICE magazine.

And Father Coughlin's Silver Jubilee is in the offing—June 29th.

SOCIAL JUSTICE magazine wants to be the vehicle to carry to him a fitting gift on that day.

This can be done only by you, readers, putting yourselves out to the extent of getting one more subscription.

It was the apathy of Father Coughlin's friends which contributed to his being kept off the airways.

It will be apathy on your part which will contribute to the eventual muzzling of SOCIAL JUSTICE magazine which is engaged in carrying on the battle.

Get your new subscriber this week.

Or, arrange with the circulation department to become a distributor, not only at a profit for yourselves but in a venture which will enable us to contribute handsomely to Father Coughlin's Silver Jubilee.

Now that you have read the above words, have they been written in vain, or—will you act now?

Good Thinking

BENJAMIN DE CASSERES has Jewish blood in his veins, so we are told.

If that is true, he is the type of Jew who, by his clear thinking and honest pen will do much for the salvation of America.

The quotation below from the pen of Mr. De Casseres, indicates that some Jews in America definitely are thinking in straight lines.

In his syndicated Hearst column, De Casseres recently wrote:

"What are the post-war aims of the European nations? Here are some ideas:

"British Labor Minister Bevin said, October 10, 1940: 'If a boy from a secondary school can save us in a Spitfire, the same brain can be turned to produce a new world.'

"A month later he said: 'The old age has passed. A new age has to be built.'

"Bevin is a friend of Soviet Russia. So you can see what Joe Stalin's friend means by a 'new world' and a 'new age.'

"Harold Laski, extreme left-wing, Moscow-tinted British labor leader and a propagandist in the United States for 'social revolution,' in an article of several thousand words in a New York pro-pink weekly entitled 'Revolution by Consent,' denounces Naziism and Fascism, but, naturally, says not a word against totalitarian Russia.

"Laski is hand-in-glove with Bevin, with the new American Ambassador, John G. Winant, and Harry Hopkins, the American leftwing herald of a 'new order.'

Here's what Laski is after:

'There is need for a European revolution, and it is the historic mission of Great Britain to inaugurate its coming. The revolution, in any case, is unavoidable. Its coming is assured.'

"It looks to me that in back of Churchill and Britain's struggle against Naziism there is now standing the Stalin-Bevin-Laski outfit—in a word, a proletarian dictatorship a la Moscow.

"And the question arises: Are we American people making an alliance with England for the commendable purpose of destroying Naziism or are we, through such emissaries as Winant and Hopkins, allying ourselves with revolutionists, who when the wreckage is complete will give Stalin the green light?

"And does that explain why we are pals with Red Russia? Are we trying to free England or enslave ourselves?"

British Retreats

When Mussolini's forces were retreating in Africa, much was made of it in the papers.

When the British were running helter-skelter across the sands, it was an orderly retreat.

Up to date the British have not stood their ground on one battlefield.

They stole out of Dunkirk, leaving the Belgians to their fate.

They are stealing out of Greece, leaving the Greeks to their fate.

Likely, they will steal out of Africa, leaving the Egyptians to their fate.

The British always have been notorious for fighting battles until the last ally was dead.

NATIONAL WEEKLY
Social Justice
Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

Britain's Power Unused

ACCORDING to *The World Almanac* the population of the British Empire approximates 500-million persons.

The population of the United States is 130-million.

The conscription of our youth—21 to 35 years of age—netted approximately 15-million registrants, half of whom —7,500,000—may be eligible for service.

On that basis, if Britain is willing to go "all out for Britain" similarly as the United States has adopted an "all aid for Britain" plan, the British, under a conscription act like ours, should register more than 50-million males between the ages of 21 and 35 and should find among them 25-million capable of bearing arms.

Britain will never assemble an army of 25-million men.

Why?

Because the territories over which fly the British Union Jack are not populated with people so foolish as we Americans.

Because Canada, for example, has no conscription law like ours, Canadians being content to have a semi-conscription law affecting for a few months only their lads for local training.

Because Britain—to put the matter plainly—does not have the practical loyalty of its wide-scattered populations —to persuade them and induce them to go all out for an economic system which—as in India—has exploited them.

Britain will not help herself.

Why should Americans do for Britain what Britain will not do for herself?

Let us look at these figures realistically. There is a wealth of meditation contained within them.

In his recent Chicago speech (April 17) Col. Charles A. Lindbergh said:

"I must tell you frankly that I believe this war was lost by England and France even before it was declared, and that it is not within our power in America today to win the war for England even though we throw the entire resources of our nation into the conflict."

Colonel Lindbergh is right.

The United States and half-hearted Britain cannot be expected to defeat the forces officered by Adolf Hitler.

What about the interventionists who want us to get into this suicidal conflict? Are they not the same interventionists responsible for getting Yugoslavia and Greece into their blood baths of destruction?

And that crime is eternally upon their consciences.

The interventionists are more properly called destructionists.

Show us an interventionist and we will show you a man or woman who would destroy the United States of America —consciously or unconsciously.

Colonel Charles A. Lindbergh became a member of The America First Committee last week.

It is the same Committee under whose auspices Senator Burton K. Wheeler speaks.

It is the same Committee under whose auspices Father Charles E. Coughlin would be speaking did he enjoy one-half as much liberty as a priest and as a citizen, as that enjoyed by Monsignor John A. Ryan of the National Catholic Welfare Council.

It is the same Committee which all non-interventionists should join in the hope of saving this country from the destructionists—the New Deal interventionists.

Read Our Editorial Reply to The New York Jewish Review